

PUBLIC LIBRARY

MAR 26 1915

DETROIT.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL XII, No. 24 }
WHOLE NO. 311 }

MARCH 27, 1915

{ PRICE 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

CHRONICLE

The War: Bulletin, Mar. 16, p. m.-Mar. 23, a. m.—Belgium and France—Poland—Galicia—The Dardanelles—Italy and Austria—Blockade of Germany, France: Financial Betterment. Germany: German Reprisals Discussed. Great Britain: America and British Reprisals—Doubts and Difficulties. Ireland: The Nation Indivisible—Industries and Indigence. Mexico: The Week and a Letter. Rome: Items of News. 577-588

TOPICS OF INTEREST

Psychology of Gambling—The Young Man and Diplomacy—Teach the Children to Read—Three World Conquests—Chances Lost and Won—Inspiring Figures—The Future of Dalmatia. 581-588

COMMUNICATIONS

Help for Destitute Mexicans—Catholics in the Y. M. C. A.—The Physician's Angel—The

Outlook's Suggestions—AMERICA in Catholic Colleges—The Metamorphosed Russian—Gothic Vestments 589-593

EDITORIALS

Boston and a Bargain—Brother Anthony—“Non-Sectarian Ethics”—Save Me from My Friends—“Pseudochromesthesia”—Open Advocacy of Sin—The Hope of the World—Saints Made While You Wait 594-598

LITERATURE

Twenty “Don’ts” of Science.

REVIEWS: The Society of the Sacred Heart—The Scotch-Irish in America—An Introduction to the Mystical Life—Practical Mysticism.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS: The New *Catholic Mind*—Some Recent Music—Two Booklets for Priests.

BOOKS RECEIVED 598-601

EDUCATION

Content of the Youthful Mind 601, 602

SOCIOLOGY

Doing God's Work 602, 603

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Church and Divorce—A Wandering “Orthodox” Archbishop—Longing for Light—The *Atlantic Monthly* and Catholicism—The Coming Constitutional Convention in New York—A Libel on French Priests—Army Laws and the French Clergy 604

CHRONICLE

The War.—Steady though slight progress is reported to have been made by the Allies in the western theater of the war. The Belgian army has been pushing forward

Bulletin, Mar. 16, p. m.-Mar. 23, a. m. along the Yser, but elsewhere fighting has been confined to artillery and gunboat fire. South of Ypres the British have gained, lost and regained ground at St. Eloi. They seem to have consolidated their new positions. The

Belgium and France French have been successful north of Arras at Notre Dame de Lorette, and in the Champagne district, in the vicinity of Perthes, Souain and Mesnil. In the Argonne and Lorraine, notwithstanding severe engagements, the situation is practically unchanged.

The battle line in Poland remains what it was a week ago. In spite of many engagements neither side has gained any notable advantage. Osowiec has shown no

Poland signs of weakening under the German bombardment, and the advance on Warsaw is as remote as ever. The

Russians captured Memel, a city in the northeastern corner of East Prussia; the Germans retook the place, however, on March 21, after a battle near the city, followed by sharp fighting in the streets. Poland is again being made to suffer the awful ravages of war. Germany has carried out her threat to exact the threefold reprisals, mentioned in our German chronicle, from the Russians. Report has it that already 95 Polish towns and larger villages have been destroyed, and 4,500 smaller villages have been devastated, of which 1,000 have been burned. These figures come from Petrograd.

The campaign in Galicia, though marked by bloody fighting, has not undergone any serious modification.

Many battles have been fought; in most cases, however, the details are meager and too uncertain for an authentic report.

Galicia Przemysl, the Galician fortress, fell to the Russians on March 22, after a heroic defence of many months against great odds. The ammunition of the Austrians gave out, and a sortie was attempted; this failed, however, and the garrison surrendered.

After a temporary lull operations were again resumed in the Dardanelles on March 18, when the allied fleet entered the strait and began a bombardment by direct fire

The Dardanelles on the inner fortifications, and especially of fort Kalid Bahr. The Turks replied vigorously, and are said to have disabled two cruisers. Floating mines, according to the British Admiralty reports, proved even more effective. Set adrift in the swift current, they were carried down stream into the area that had already been cleared, and resulted in the sinking of one French and two British battleships. Reports from Berlin and Athens differ as to the extent to which the fortifications have been damaged. In spite of the losses of the Allies, the attack on the strait is still continuing.

The negotiations that have been under way between Italy and Austria seem to be barren of results. No result has been forthcoming from the pressure which for

Italy and Austria some time has been brought to bear on the Dual Monarchy apparently by both Germany and Italy. Austria is firm in her refusal to cede the provinces of Trent and Triest, although there seems to be a disposition on her part to give up both places when the war is over, in case Italy continues her policy of neutrality to the end. The frontier is too valuable from a military standpoint, so it is reported, for Austria to think of parting with it at

present. Meanwhile the Italian newspapers are talking of Italy's sacred aspirations toward national unity, of her obligation to profit by her actual military and diplomatic advantages, and of the opportuneness of the moment of departing from what she calls her long-continued policy of self-sacrifice in the interests of peace. There are many indications that Italy is preparing for war.

During the week the correspondence between the United States and Germany, France and Great Britain was made known. It consists of five notes. The Order in Council was also sent by the Allies

Blockade of Germany to Washington. The outcome is

simply an utter failure on the part of the United States to effect any modification of the conditions which are seriously interfering with the trade of neutral nations, and especially the trade of the United States. Germany agreed to accede to the American suggestions, but conditioned her agreement on certain concessions to be made by the Allies. France and Great Britain have not only refused to adopt our plan or make the concessions, but have published the details of the reprisals by which they declared some time ago they intended to reply to the war zone operations of the German submarines. France and Great Britain have proclaimed what is practically a blockade of an unprecedented type. Germany is to be cut off from all commerce. No goods of any kind are to be allowed either to enter or leave Germany. No merchant vessels carrying goods destined for German ports, or for neutral ports but for German use, or carrying goods that are German property or of German origin, or goods laden at a German port, are to be allowed to proceed on their way. They must discharge all such goods in a British port, except in the case where the vessel receives a pass allowing her to proceed to a neutral port, which is to be specifically designated. Large discretionary powers are given to the officials of the prize courts to deal with such goods as shall have been discharged, in order that the demands of justice and the interests of neutrals may be safeguarded. The sphere of operation of the blockade is restricted to European waters, including the Mediterranean. The United States is certain to make representations, perhaps, however, only when occasion arises, both in the interests of her trade and also as a protest against the arbitrary setting aside of the rules of international law. Her voice, however, will have no other effect than to lay the foundation for the recovery of damages when the war is over, and to free herself from any appearance of acquiescence in the action of the European Governments.

France.—A bill to raise the limit for the issue of the Treasury defence bonds by one billion francs was unanimously passed in the Chamber of Deputies on March 18.

Financial Betterment The Minister of Finance, M. Ribon, took the occasion to lay before the House a statement of the financial conditions of France. The great difficulties which in the

beginning faced the Treasury are now being successfully overcome. The manner in which the people have taken the defence bonds has surpassed all expectation. "If it is possible to administer wisely the finances of the country," he said, "the merit is that of the entire people. It is the little savings in the woolen stockings which have come to the aid of the country. The gold has come in the beginning not from the large cash boxes, but from pocket-books. The river is composed of little brooks." The national defence bonds had yielded up to March 12 the sum of 3,862,000,000 francs. Alongside the prospect of larger expenses, owing to such new operations as the expedition to the Dardanelles, he believed that there were reassuring indications of a restoration of the business of the country. Besides the increase in direct taxation, the revenues from indirect taxation are being increased, while the customs deficit is diminishing. The foreign trade statistics of France for the first two months of 1915 show a decrease of 632,000,000 francs as compared with the statistics of 1914, while the decrease of the first five months of the war was at the rate of 820,000,000 francs a month. These figures are taken to indicate a revival of trade. A discussion was likewise introduced into the Chamber of Deputies concerning a new law for the protection of owners in the case of securities lost through the occupation of French provinces by the Germans. It was said that the total value of such securities is so important as to constitute a formidable loss to French investors.

Germany.—A stormy scene took place in the Reichstag March 20. It was occasioned by the military reprisals determined upon to end the acts of Russian vandalism said

German Reprisals Discussed to have taken place in East Prussia. The German official announcement stated that during the first invasion

10,000 houses had been burned, 2,000 non-combatants murdered and 4,000 carried off into Russia; and that during the second invasion 4,000 of the 15,000 civilians who had remained in the province until November were either murdered or dragged away and no fewer than 81,000 private dwellings systematically plundered. Valuables and furniture are said to have been sent to Russia by rail. About the same time it was stated that bands of Russians had again broken into the northeast section of the province and burned houses and villages. In reprisal German military authorities declared that for every German village destroyed three Russian villages must be given up to the flames and that for the damage done in Memel Russian government buildings must be laid low. The Socialist Representative Ledebour declared that he was horrified at this decree and Liebknecht shouted "It is barbarism!" This episode called forth an uproar in the House. The Nationalist leader Bassermann answered that such reprisals were indeed to be regretted. "But if the Russians set fire right and left and violate our women, are we then to demand that our military officers must not take such measures as will put an end to this inhuman warfare."

The Centrist Gröber then rose to say that military authorities should not be hindered from taking the strongest measures which international law permits, if forced to such a course by Russian acts. Ledebour's criticism was declared unconstitutional and Herr Scheidemann, in the name of the Socialist party, stated that the speaker had made these remarks on his own responsibility and that he alone was to be held accountable for them and not the party. The Vice-Chancellor and Minister of the Interior, Herr von Delbrück, thought it was not becoming his position to take farther cognizance of the remarks than to say that they were "insulting and directed against the illustrious leader of the German army." The war, he said, was "offering new proof to the enemy of the economic and moral invincibility of the German people." It was evident, therefore, that the Reichstag considered itself justified in leaving to the military authorities all decision regarding the morality of the reprisals in question, which were looked upon as precautionary acts.

Great Britain.—The attitude of the United States toward British reprisals is causing much discussion. Some of this is heated and some calm. The general con-

America and British Reprisals demnation of Great Britain's action by our own papers is noted with regret and the opinion is ventured that our position is founded on a misapprehension. The more important British papers declare that it is England's purpose to respect the rights of trade "as far as the manifold necessities of their own military position allow." The claim is set forth that, though at first blush England's reprisal-measures may "be regarded as a departure from old practice," yet they "can be reconciled with fundamental principles of international law as applied to the wholly new state of circumstances which have arisen in the present struggle." Americans are reminded that "the adjustment of old principles to new conditions is of the essence of legal progress." A case in point is the doctrine of the continuous voyage elaborated by us in the "Civil War." The apologists for the reprisals set forth that in the present struggle the forces are largely conscript armies, and thus the old distinction between armed forces and the civil population is obliterated. The "army is the people in arms, and food for the people is necessarily to a great extent food for the army." Moreover, the German decree of January 25, putting all grain and flour under Governmental control, makes the German Government the consignee of all, or practically all, the imported foodstuffs. Then again, Germans, it is urged, should not object to the British measures, for two of their Chancellors, Bismarck and Caprivi, defended the seizure that England is insisting on. No reliance is put on any guarantee that Germany gave or would give, for England, it is stated, has no reason to believe that promises would be kept. The *Times* closes a singularly well-written article on the subject with these rather remarkable words:

Under the guidance of men like Bright and W. E. Forster, who understood the greatness and the value to mankind of the ideals for which the North was fighting, the British democracy did not scrutinize too closely the acts of a kindred people struggling for its life. Therein they showed the large wisdom and the large generosity of their race. May they not hope to-day, when they have been plunged against their will into a conflict yet more deadly, for aims which are not less high, that America will do unto them as, in the day of her visitation and of her trial, they did unto her?

A recent *Times* has a striking editorial on a communication from a British officer "who has been much in contact with the French." The gist of the officer's message

Doubts and Difficulties is that "France is at war as a nation," and that England must realize that she is "not less in for it" than France.

This premised, the officer insists that it is most important "to inflict a decisive defeat on the enemy in the field before the next harvest restores their strength and confidence." The *Times* declares that this plain warning is very badly needed, for "the nation as a whole does not realize that it is at war as the French nation does." The House of Commons gets a drubbing for wasting time over trifles, and is reminded that to wrangle over boys on farms and such like incidents is unreal and ridiculous. The continual danger of strikes is causing much uneasiness, especially since "important munitions of war urgently needed by the army and navy" are apt to be held up, with consequent danger to the safety of the soldiers and sailors. "How are we to fulfil our obligations to our allies," exclaims the paper, "if they (employers and employees) persist in keeping up the sordid quarrels of which they are so fond in times of peace?"

Ireland.—Speaking at a National Volunteer demonstration in Belfast, Mr. Dillon defended the wisdom of Mr. Redmond's policy in advising Irishmen to fight with Eng-

The Nation Indivisible land in the present war. The glory and military knowledge Irish recruits would win would prove an irresistible power at the back of the Irish Party in any struggle that might be forced on them in the future. And they were prepared for such a struggle:

Assembled in the Celtic Park of Belfast to-day we tell all whom it may concern that, while we are willing to travel on the road to conciliation, always on the condition that other parties enter on that road to meet us, we will never consent—and I say it here in the face of you, the Volunteers of Belfast, who may yet have to make good my words—we shall never consent to divide this island or this nation, and we shall never consent to allow any section, clique, or faction to rule the people of Ireland.

He added that the opponents of Mr. Redmond's war policy were "cranks and soreheads," though he admitted they were numerous. His further statement that the majority of Irish-Americans supported Mr. Redmond in the matter is not in accord with their newspaper organs and public pronouncements. The usual St. Patrick's Day banquets and speeches under the auspices of the Irish Party were discontinued this year.

Two bacon and meat supply factories, established a few years ago in Tipperary and Wexford, have doubled their output in the last year and declared handsome dividends.

Industries and Indigence Other industries, especially in textiles, have also prospered during the year, with the result that there

have been many recent prosecutions for the sale of bogus "Irish made" materials, and the adulteration of inferior British or foreign goods with Irish. The stress caused by the war and the increased demand by the War Office for food and clothing materials, occasioning both a large rise in prices and considerable fraud, are accentuating the sufferings of the poor in many localities. Generally there is no lack of employment, but employers in town and country can not afford to pay the wages which the inflated prices of coal, food and other necessities make needful for decent living. Meanwhile the Government has withdrawn its usual grants for national libraries, museums and various other public purposes.

Mexico.—This week the story of Mexico is the same as it was last week. There were battles and robberies and murders and taxation and protests and promises of

The Week and a Letter amendments and all those other atrocities and stupidities to which the civilized and intelligent world is trying

to accustom itself. Mexico's cause seems hopeless. A private letter, written from Mexico City on March 15, throws a lurid light on conditions under Obregon. The writer, an American of five years' residence in the capital, first pays his respects to the leaders of the factions, insisting that the outrages narrated in our papers have actually taken place, and then proceeds as follows:

When I walked down the Avenue Juarez the other day the street was filled with hundreds of the very poor clamoring for bread; in front of the hotel which is the headquarters of the commander-in-chief of the garrison of the city, there were scores of Yaqui Indians drawn up, rifles ready, as if they meant business; around the corner a squadron of Yaqui cavalry waited, rifle on thigh; two armed automobiles stood in the middle of the street, their guns commanding the broad thoroughfare; they looked solemn and impressive in their dull gray paint, soldiers peering through the loop-holes. I thought to myself of the terrible havoc they were capable of spreading among a crowd of unarmed people—they looked so exceedingly, so terribly business-like. And then my eyes wandered upward to the balconies crowded with laughing officers (doubtless jesting together about the helpless demonstration of the suffering people of this city), and then higher still to the place where the red, white and green tricolor of Mexico blew from the staff and I saw that the flag was in tatters, and it seemed so symbolic, the flag of their country torn and trampled under foot by the smallest percentage of the population (even as it was actually trampled under foot at the Convention of Aguascalientes a few months ago by the representative of Zapata and his followers who referred to it as a rag), the country starving and in ruins and these men dashing up and down the principal avenues in stolen automobiles, levying extraordinary taxes on merchants and others. . . . You will have read in the press of the scores of outrages committed by General Alvaro Obregon since his advent in our midst as ruler of the destinies of the

half million souls that are here. No doubt the versions as they reached the United States were garbled, but they can not have exaggerated the terrible condition of affairs which exists in Mexico City, since Obregon and his 25,000 Yaqui Indians occupied the city. . . . You have heard of the arrests of the Catholic priests after he had invited them to the Palace to confer with him as to the best means of relieving the necessities of the poor, who were on the verge of absolute starvation. . . . I have not space sufficient to tell of the manner in which he tried to arouse the masses to rise up and sack the city, when he was refused the money. . . . He seized one of the principal churches of the city and converted it into a club for the local branch of the I. W. W., which is perhaps one of the worst products of the revolution. . . . His men sacked churches in different parts of the city and carried off all the silver and brass ornaments, candlesticks, chandeliers, etc., on which they could lay hands. His continued imprisonment of the priests has made Mass impossible for over a fortnight. Paid gangs of ruffians picked from the ranks of the I. W. W. attacked processions of women marching in an orderly protest against the treatment of the clergy.

The Yaqui cavalry charged assemblages of men. He permitted, encouraged demonstrations of the I. W. W., who marched through the streets calling on people to rise up and destroy property, to sack and to loot. His officers cheered to the echo speeches made by the leaders of the I. W. W., in which people were told that "Christ was a mere invention of the Mexican clergy who used the myth to exploit the ignorance of the poor." They cheered men like Salazar when he called upon the people "to attack the churches and tear down the silver images of Christ."

Rome.—Antonio Cardinal Agliardi died in Rome on March 20, in his eighty-second year. The dead prelate had a most distinguished career. Twelve years after his

Items of News ordination he was sent to Canada, in a minor official position, and on his return to Rome was made secretary to the Propaganda. In 1884 Leo XIII created him Arch-

bishop of Cæsarea, and sent him on a diplomatic mission to India in that year, and again in 1887. Later, in 1889, he was Nuncio at Munich, where he served till 1892, when he was transferred to Vienna. In 1896 he was recalled to Rome and elevated to the rank of Cardinal. It is reported that it was he who suggested that perhaps the belligerent nations would rest on their arms during the conclave which elected the present Pope, thereby testifying to the peaceful mission of the Holy Father. Cardinal Agliardi is the fourth of the Sacred College to die during the present pontificate. The others are Cardinals Ferrata, Di Pietro and Tecchi. There are now twelve vacancies in the College. The Holy Father still preserves the utmost neutrality. His position, difficult by its very nature, has been made doubly so by the bitter attacks on him, emanating principally from France. Apparently there is an organized attempt to make French and Belgian Catholics discontented with the Vatican. Maeterlinck's impudent tirade overreached itself; its very insensate bitterness opened the eyes of many to the truth, and the speech of the wandering Fleming, who years ago forgot the doctrine of Christ which he would now teach His Holiness, has deeply offended many people.

TOPICS OF INTEREST

Psychology of Gambling

IN common use, but rarely understood in its technical and proper sense, the phrase "psychology of gambling" merits attention and study. Psychology deals with mental processes as such, and the use of the term in connection with gambling suggests an examination of mental processes and emotional forces which come into play when man is engaged in games of chance. Man is a composite being. He is possessed of a soul, which we rather describe than define when we say that it is the "principle by which man lives and knows and desires." Likewise he is possessed of a body containing material forces and supplying material energy as an auxiliary for his many and varied mental operations. The rational soul is gifted with intellect and will, the former having for its object truth, the latter goodness. Emotional forces are found also in man, and play an important part in his mental, moral and physical well-being. By the proper exercise of rational control man is enabled so to coordinate his mental faculties and emotional forces as to effect a harmonious development of all his powers. A proper exercise of the emotions, in conjunction with other powers, moves the strong to help the weak; the wealthy to assist the needy, and the fortunate to provide for the less favored. An unbridled sway of the emotions leads to wanton destruction of life, liberty, happiness and property. Within their proper sphere and under a control wisely regulated the emotional forces are valuable assets, contributing largely to man's complete growth. When, however, they are allowed unrestrained sway, they prove to be serious hindrances, endangering, and oftentimes actually destroying man's solidarity.

Man is by nature a creature of thought. From a storehouse of ideas he forms his judgments, standards and principles. We are all character builders, whether consciously or otherwise, and the problems attending our intellectual and moral activities frequently call for highly concentrated application and study. Continued mental effort is arduous and can not be exercised indefinitely. To a greater or less degree restraint is exercised by the will over the emotional forces, while the attention is focused upon problems of thought. The rest we seek after hours of mental exercise is imperative for mental recuperation, and is needed to afford the emotional forces freedom from the inhibitory pressure exercised over them while we are mentally engaged. Released from marked restraining pressure, the emotions seek an outlet for expression; and the relaxation so sought is not healthy, unless it be rational.

The fatigued mind does not necessarily find relief only in a cessation of activity. Often a change of occupation is amply sufficient. To this may be traced the fact that gaming has been accepted generally from the earliest

period of history as one of the most widely-known means of mental relaxation.

Gaming, as a healthy means to an end, namely, mental rest and relaxation, needs no defence from a psychological standpoint; but continued participation in games of chance for the game itself, and for the pleasure afforded, is undeniably harmful. It destroys the mental stamina of the participant. The old adage, "anger sharpens the mind," has its limitations. Anger does not sharpen the mind in a rational sense. It rather distorts the vision, it magnifies the nature and extent of the alleged injury, and renders one incapable of analyzing conditions. A rational examination of the subject of disturbance is possible only before the dispassionate tribunal of reason. So, too, it is with the gambler. The ever-increasing desire for personal gain causes him to see upon a distorted retina only the outcome of a particular game, it blinds him to all else save his immediate personal triumph. The emotions are unrestrained and the rapid transition of feeling from one extreme to another presages mental, moral and physical deterioration on the part of the participant. From the standpoint of psychology alone, therefore, the gambling practice is reprehensible. No man can indulge in the practice of gambling habitually, and some men not even occasionally, without losing that "sound mind in a sound body," which is a fundamental requisite, demanded by the laws of psychology as a condition for healthy, normal progress.

From the moral standpoint, and in the earlier periods of history, healthy participation in games of chance had the approval and the encouragement of the nations of antiquity. Incorporated in the religions of the ancients, as well as in the laws of the people, chance continued to be an element of religion, law and sociability, until the decline of the nations of antiquity. The vicious gambling practices which came into vogue were subsequently condemned and prohibited, but without effect. With the advent of Christianity gaming practices were not distinguished from gambling, but were condemned and prohibited by early churchmen because they were considered, in themselves, outgrowths of paganism. In the spurious treatise "De Aleatoribus," attributed to St. Cyprian, the keynote of opposition of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the practice was voiced in the main thought of the treatise, "*estilo potius non aleator sed christianus*," and consistent with such view the Synod of Elvira (probably 305 A. D.) set forth the first declaration of the Church against the practice, as an organization.

With the overthrow of paganism as an organized opponent of Christianity, there were adopted gradually by the writers on morals, the distinction between gaming as a healthy pastime and gambling as a vicious outgrowth of gaming. This distinction, first appearing in the writings of Saint John Chrysostom, and repeated by John of Salisbury, was developed in its fulness by Saint Thomas Aquinas, who as the Prince of the Schoolmen needs no introduction to a student of scholas-

tic theology or philosophy. The healthy aspects of gaming were set forth by him in his treatment *De Ludo*. His position is simply this, that gaming as a means to an end is recreative and useful, since it affords a proper field for the activities of the tired mind or wearied body. Gambling, however, the saint calls a vicious outgrowth of gaming, and, since it entails an *immoderatus amor habendi*, it is a practice to be avoided by all. (*Summa Theologica*, 2-2, Q. 118, Art. 1-8.) Gaming as a means to recreation is quite different from gambling indulged in for itself. The former is good, the latter is evil. The analysis of the subject from a psychological and ethical point of view, as presented by St. Thomas, suggests fundamental principles, which could well be applied with effectiveness to any problem concerned with the practice of gambling. From the psychological, ethical and sociological standpoint the practice is one which should meet with whole-hearted condemnation from sensible people in all walks of life.

LESTER B. DONAHUE, PH.D.

The Young Man and Diplomacy*

DIPLOMACY is not yet a career in the United States, but approaches it more nearly than ever before. Despite the losses in personnel consequent upon changes of administration, and the waste of public money involved in training a man to a difficult profession, only to throw him aside when he is fitted for his task, the American diplomatic service has steadily progressed in efficiency during the past twenty-five years. The need of a corps of experts in international affairs is becoming daily more evident to the thinking American who understands his country's relation to the rest of the world and the vast changes brought about by the world-war. Thus, the present administration, in spite of general belief to the contrary, has so made appointments that the majority of our diplomats now charged with the enormous and delicate task of caring for belligerent interests in Europe and of safeguarding our own, are tried men chosen for past services to the nation, irrespective of political party.

Our diplomatic service is, as has been observed by several able writers in recent magazine issues, our "first line of defence." It is in theory, and is becoming in practice, a body of highly-trained experts. Its work is not primarily political and in this sense different from the consular service—an error of public opinion which has always hampered the senior branch. The two branches can no more be separated than, to use a homely example, the sales manager for a district and the agencies of his firm throughout that district. The manager may have more to say about the policy of the firm or company than the local agents, but they work together, each on his own line.

The diplomatic representative of the United States is

the guardian, in the land to which he is accredited, of his country's interests. He must be alert, highly-educated and well balanced in judgment, cool, fearless, appreciative of the point of view of others, tactful, patient and quick-witted. He must have first of all a thorough knowledge of the principles on which our Government was founded, and of the development of our national institutions, good and bad. He must be widely versed in the national and sectional life of our country, and understand our varied interests in their true relations at home and abroad; he must know those forces which have made us what we are, and are now creating a nation, and which in our generation are reacting upon Europe and the rest of the world. It is not sufficient for him to be merely a patriotic American, though it is essential that he be so, for the glamor of European life is great. He must understand the country to which he is accredited, as well as he does his own; moreover, he must understand what outer forces may affect his usefulness in his immediate sphere. He must be, in a true sense, a historian, and go to the very foundations of international intercourse. It is, in my opinion, not essential that he belong to the political party in power, for he is serving the nation, not a party or a State or a section of the country, still less a person, be that person the Secretary of State, the President or a political leader. Least of all is he serving private commercial interests. To the national representative are given aides from the lower ranks of the diplomatic service, and from the navy and army, as well as commercial experts. These officials, sharing in different degrees in his privileges, form his intelligence service. They are his ears, eyes and hands, and submit their observations and deductions to his judgment. They can be of the greatest assistance in his work of protecting and extending American interests, or they can, and sometimes do, through lack of understanding of their duties and hearty cooperation, hamper his work intolerably. Under our present system of appointment to specific posts, too often, still, through political influence, it is difficult for the State Department to come to the assistance of the nation's representative and change or withdraw such an inefficient subordinate. Around this group of officials revolves the consular corps, spread through the country in its principal ports and places of commerce, specializing again in matters of commercial interest and guarding the immediate and local personal or business interests of their nation. The consular service can not be separated from the diplomatic service. It is an integral part of the same national intelligence bureau. Consuls should take their general policy from the diplomatic representative, who in turn is responsible to the President through the Secretary of State.

Assuming that we have a young man, presumably a college graduate with some years of professional or business life in one of our great centers, and a sound knowledge of languages, ancient and modern, who fully realizes the qualifications necessary to represent his

*The twenty-ninth of a series of vocational articles.

country eventually; assuming that he has been formally presented to the State Department as a candidate, has passed his examinations and has received his commission from the President, under the Seal of the United States, appointing him "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," to be a junior Secretary of Legation or Embassy, he will, for at least thirty days be attached to the Department of State for special instruction. He will then proceed to his post by the shortest route, reporting his arrival and drawing on the Department, when authorized, for his traveling expenses at the rate of so many cents a mile. He will report at once to his chief of mission, who will assign him his special routine duties. The daily work of every legation and embassy is divided among the secretaries. There is even in the smallest missions, a vast deal of correspondence: letters concerning business opportunities, complaints, requests for an infinite variety of information, consular correspondence, passports, personal interviews with resident and traveling Americans (the most exacting and critical of all people), preparation of correspondence with local officials or with the Foreign Office, despatches and code cables to and from the State Department, reports on special subjects for the Department, for Congress, for Commissions or Chambers of Commerce, for the Department of Agriculture, of Labor and Commerce, etc., all these make a full day in the dullest season, and in times of stress may overwhelm the most strenuous worker. I venture to say that no European service could have stood the strain suddenly thrown upon ours by this war, under the same conditions. When our young secretary has been assigned his normal work, he makes, with his chief, his official calls on the Foreign Office and principal officials, on the Dean of the diplomatic body of the capital, and exchanges calls with every member of each foreign embassy and legation. Next he will be invited by the official world, and these entertainments are of vast importance, for through this medium he learns to know the men with whom his official duties bring him in contact, as he could never know them in an office chair and discussing business.

From then on a large part of his time is taken up in social engagements. This is the side of his duty which calls for a clearer judgment on his part than any other, lest he truly lapse into utter frivolity and confirm the popular belief in the essential triviality of a diplomat's life. The greatest profit may be drawn from these social activities for his country, not because dinners and dancing make international friendships or advance commerce, but because the intimate life which these functions typify give the diplomat priceless opportunities to know from the inside, as it were, and off their guard, all classes of the people among whom he is living, and he may thus get at facts and real opinion of vast importance in subsequent negotiations.

It is of the highest importance, as we have all seen in recent international transactions, that the President should

have at his disposal either in the Department of State or in foreign countries, a number of men whose integrity and practical and personal experience extending over many years, can be relied on to steer a safe and honorable course through selfish and conflicting interests. If, when an emergency arises, the service provided by law and supported by the taxpayer is inadequate to meet it, the fault lies primarily with its appointing power.

The chief arguments advanced against the field of diplomacy as a vocation are: the limited number employable in this branch of the public service; the insufficient remuneration, and the insecurity of tenure.

The first objection can not be overcome; the field is necessarily limited, but the national service rendered is of the highest, and the experience gained is of the broadest. The second is a difficulty that will be surmounted, I believe, in the not distant future, for public opinion expressed in the press and in Congress is growing more urgent in favor of relieving the diplomatic service, at least, of the burden of rental of offices and dwellings, and possibly also of entertainments now paid for out of the salaries allowed by the nation. At present no diplomat may hope for advancement after a certain point who is not independently wealthy, no matter what his services may have been, and this condition forces on the President the choice of men who are willing to spend their fortunes in return for the great prestige and prominence, political and social, which their position of privilege and honor at a foreign seat of Government may give them, or who, being wealthy, are sufficiently high-minded and disinterested to be glad to guard their country's interests at their own expense. This is a situation both dangerous and improper, and it is not relieved by the fact that the United States has been so fortunate as to possess many such high-minded public servants, nor by the fact that with all our handicaps the diplomatic service has guarded and advanced true American interests abroad in a manner which calls forth the admiration of those who have followed its history and made allowance for its restrictions. The third point, uncertainty of office, until the United States have acquired a national point of view, have understood international needs and adequately provided for a service to meet those needs, is a safeguard rather than a drawback. Until that time there is danger of narrowness, affectation of foreign rather than American ideas, stagnation and general inefficiency in the unassailable tenure of office of so small a body.

We are being sobered and broadened by the vast responsibilities of our position as the greatest non-belligerent in the world to-day, by our vitally changed relations with Europe and with Latin America, by the dangers as well as duties which encompass us on all sides, and we must come out of it, I think, with a clearer perception of our nationality and a more definite plan of action than we have ever had, for our development at home and abroad. In this new relation to the world our diplomats must play a leading rôle, as guides and teachers of our

own people and as exponents of our civilization to our neighbors across the seas.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS,
Sometime Minister to Guatemala.

Teach the Children to Read

OF the many suggestions that have been made for the furtherance of the apostolate of the press, not the least practical, and certainly one of the most enduring, is the recent scheme to introduce into Catholic high schools and colleges the reading and discussion of some Catholic weekly. The proposal commends itself not merely for its immediate advantages, but also, and principally, because it opens a way for training our young people in a matter that is of supreme importance. An intelligent reading of current literature is undoubtedly most desirable. How many boys and girls go out from our schools with no interest in the newspapers and magazines save the sporting, fashion and fictional sheets; and to their shame be it confessed, with a furtive and only half restrained curiosity in the latest murder and divorce scandal? The morbid character of modern life is, of course, mainly responsible for this deterioration of taste. Nevertheless no slight share of the blame is to be laid at the door of our educational institutions.

During the years of their collegiate and academic courses the pupils are given a rather satisfactory training in secular subjects, and this in spite of many obstacles, such as partial lack of equipment, the absence of literary home traditions, and the utter disinclination for serious application to difficult tasks that is so characteristic of the student of to-day. As a rule also there are laid the foundations of an intelligent Catholic life through an understanding of the Church's doctrines. Moral development too is looked after, the heart is schooled and the will is strengthened to resist what is wrong and to strive for what is good. But it is rare to find graduates of our Catholic schools who have been taught to read newspapers and magazines.

As a consequence they find themselves at a great disadvantage, and instead of maintaining the high level that their *alma mater* fondly but not over confidently hopes for, they content themselves with fiction, which when it is not worse is generally of an ephemeral value. Events that are of national and international importance have no attraction for them. The editorial page of the dailies that form public opinion, is passed over assiduously and without even a regret. Subjects that touch the very springs of their Catholic interests leave them unmoved. Catholic activities and the possibilities and legitimate demands of the lay apostolate, which in other lands are the very staff of the Catholic's life, they neither care for nor understand. The habits and principles of right thinking, in which their teachers so laboriously exercised them, go to waste. They do not apply them to current problems, nor use them to test the rectitude of the statements

of those irresponsible writers and thinkers who are moulding current thought. And the result? They take their opinions ready made.

Things would not be so bad, if they had learned the habit of serious Catholic reading. Were they careful to inform themselves from our representative weeklies, though they might not dare to pass judgment themselves, they would at least have correct views. Unfortunately, however, when the habit has not been cultivated in youth, it is seldom acquired in age. Those who have not brought, from the class and lecture rooms with their diploma, a habit of challenging public pronouncements, and testing them to see if they square with natural and revealed truth, will not, except in rare and isolated instances, begin to do so afterwards. In this matter, more perhaps than in most others, some initiation and training is necessary.

It would be unfair to ourselves to think that this defect is characteristic of ourselves alone. It is a national defect. It is more or less true of a large portion of the graduates of all our American colleges and universities. These, however, are making strenuous efforts to remedy the defect. In many schools there has been introduced a custom that has long existed in the better universities. Clubs have been formed in the colleges for the purpose of discussing the current magazines. High schools confine themselves for the most part to a single weekly which they discuss under the guidance of their teachers.

This practice can not be too highly commended. We might well adopt it ourselves. The correct and appreciative attitude toward the more serious and the more dangerous part of our journalism needs cultivating. Parents and pastors complain and not without justice that we do not teach the children how and what to read. In this matter they contend there is a crying need of training. Why do we not remove the reproach? In non-Catholic schools boys and girls are educated to read with pleasure and discernment such papers as the *Literary Digest*, the *Outlook*, the *Independent* and the *Nation*. Even in Catholic schools some of these papers have been made the medium of a course in reading. The choice might be happier, but the practice is excellent, and should commend itself to all Catholic teachers of older children. Apart from the supernatural means of grace, there is scarcely a means more likely to perpetuate the results of Catholic education, to foster piety and to make the Church's children what she has a right to expect that they shall be, than the regular reading and discussion in the school room of a representative Catholic weekly.

If such reading and discussion were customary, our teachers would not be called upon to lament that their work is almost entirely undone soon after the graduation of their pupils; and bishops and priests would have less cause to complain that graduates of Catholic colleges not only take little or no interest in Catholic thought and achievement, but are often decidedly un-Catholic in their viewpoint.

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

Three World Conquests

THE future historian, looking back over the course of the past centuries of Christianity, will be able to discern three great epochs. They will stand out like giant landmarks, each momentous in its importance for the destinies of the whole human race. The first will doubtless be the era of the Cæsars and the triumph of the early Church. The second will be the period of the barbarian invasions of civilized Europe and the reconquest of the world for Christ. The third we may regard as the time of which our own generation forms a part.

The great world war might naturally be considered the distinguishing mark of this last period. Yet such is not the case. It is only one of many, not less portentous, effects of a movement whose culmination had been reached before ever the fatal shot was fired by the youthful criminal in the streets of Sarajevo. He himself was but a product of the world-wide materialistic propaganda. The first mighty impulse of this movement had been given far back in the days of the Reformation. Since then it had grown like a wave before the wind, increasing in volume and destructive force till its toppling crest has now begun to crumble into ruin.

All three epochs, nevertheless, were characterized alike by vast world conquests. Two of these periods have passed into history and can now be studied in their completeness. In both we find a striking similarity in the action of God's Providence. In each a material conquest, most widespread in extent, was achieved by a power standing in opposition to the laws of God. In each a spiritual conquest followed, no less universal in extent, and brought to pass by a power which was not of this earth. Will the same course of events once more be repeated? Neither the action of man's free will nor the designs of God's Providence, the two determining factors of all history, can be foretold with certainty. But it is none the less possible to draw from the past convincing reasons for hope and confidence.

The first of the three world conquests began with the triumph of the Roman arms. We behold in the pagan Rome of old the very sublimation of purely material power. Beneath its art and literature, its glory and refinement, what leprosy and cruel corruption! "Without affection, without fidelity, without mercy," was the Apostle's characterization of that pagan civilization, delivered up in its pride to a reprobate sense and doing without remorse the things worthy of death. It was all a triumph of "the world," of the threefold concupiscence of fallen man. Yet God's dispensation made of it the preparation for the spread of His own Kingdom. The ends of the earth had been placed under tribute to Rome that Christianity might follow in the way of the marching armies. The roads built by the Roman legionaries had been laid straight and smooth for the feet of the Apostles. Little did the haughty Cæsars deem, as they looked upon the Christian victims staining the sands of the

arena with their blood, that from those precious drops of life blood there should spring the conquering army of the Cross of Christ.

Splendid as was the first great triumph of the Church, and productive of all the wonders of God's grace in the hearts of men, yet it only delayed but did not avert the fall of that ancient civilization into which the vices of paganism had eaten deeply. The sanctity of the Church indeed had never failed through all these centuries and saints without number shone like stars in her firmament; but the earth in general required a renewal and the hour was at hand.

The second world conquest now followed. The deluge of barbarism swept like a tidal wave over Europe. Rough shod the savage hordes rode onward, regardless of ancient splendors, of the glory that once was Rome and the pride that had marked her conquests. New "lords of the earth," they had come to take their place at the banquet table. The Church was again to pass through new ordeals; but the Providence of God was not wanting. Amid the wreck of a world she alone survived, sublime in her beauty and strength, girding herself anew for the task of spiritual conquest and the social reconstruction of Christian civilization.

Wild and wilful children of nature, untamed and untutored, slaves to a cruel superstition, filled with the greed of pillage, with the lust of battle in their blood, the savage hordes that now repeopled Europe called indeed for all her patience and all her firmness, no less than for all her motherly love. To subdue their fierceness, to cultivate their minds by learning, to train their hearts to gentleness and form in them the likeness of the meek and humble Christ was indeed a long and weary labor. Yet never did the Church fail or falter. A second time she conquered the conquerors of the world.

Can the wonder, we ask, be thrice repeated? Nothing surely is impossible with God. A third period of world conquest is unrolled before us. Paganism has won its third great victory. The era of a triumphant materialism has been completed. It has passed into history like the conquest of the Cæsars and the smiting of the nations with the hammer of Thor. No Roman eagles, no trampling march of savage armies has marked its progress. It has taken place silently and often almost imperceptibly, by royal decrees and votes of parliament, in press and school and university, on the platform and the stage, in the home and in the workshop. Christianity at times was not even attacked. It sufficed to overlook Christ. The rest would follow. It did follow. Materialism became a god. Once more amid the universal desolation one power alone remains, uncompromising, untouched and uncontaminated by the spirit of the world. It is the same Church which of old resisted the pagan Cæsars and stood sublime above the deluge of the wild barbarian hordes, the Church which Christ has founded upon Peter, to which He promised His abiding presence and against which the Gates of Hell can not prevail.

Through all this period of stress and storm her purity of doctrine, indeed, had never suffered; but again there was needed a renewal of charity on the part of many of her members. Her mark of sanctity had never been lost. There were saints then as ever. But much that was defective and sinful in individual lives was swept away with the Reformation. There was a new intensity of faith whose effects we may confidently look forward to now.

The reign of that blindest of all blind superstitions, materialism, is passing: its sway over the minds of men has already begun to decline. Yet it is far from ended. The spiritual conquest of the world in the days of the Cæsars was not accomplished until all the strength of persecution had been put forth in vain. The total regeneration in spirit and truth of the wild hordes was the labor not of a decade of years, nor of a single generation, but of entire centuries. Victory came through tears and the blood of martyrs. We can not forecast the future. One thing we know: the "Great Advance" has sounded, the call to renew all things in Christ. Singly and unitedly, we must give to the task the best of our energies, *Spe gaudentes*, rejoicing in hope, looking forward to a third great spiritual conquest of the world.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

Chances Lost and Won*

ONE of our oldest inconsistencies is our veritable passion for making laws. We like to feel that we are moving away from empty formalism, we like to assume that justice and equity mean more to us than the mere externals of the law; yet we take every available occasion to multiply these externals and to submerge equity in a flood of technical and unwieldy forms.

I have often wondered, as a matter of curiosity, just how much the good behavior and order in a Catholic community is due to legislation, and just how much to the direct influence of the Church through the confessional. I think the facts, if they could be gathered, would be extraordinarily interesting. After all, if a man is upright and honest for religious reasons, he very seldom has to concern himself with statute law. He might live his whole life through and never once come into conflict with the State. To the average citizen, it is enough to know that murder is morally wrong. He knows little and cares less about the methods of criminal trial and the penalties of the law. He has no thought of murdering. The same is true of the grosser forms of stealing. It is only the burglar who is interested in the kinds of evidence necessary to convict a thief.

If this is so evidently true of the broad moral lines, why is it not equally true of the finer distinctions? Is it not far more important to have the individual business man honest for good religious reasons than to threaten

him with a hundred statutes? Of course, we must have statutes, just as we must have criminal law; but we must use common sense in making these statutes. They should be made to cover the exceptional cases rather than the general ones.

I know of an interesting story somewhat to this effect: A certain man had a mania for burning up his house after he had lived in it only six months. This happened with three or four successive houses, until at last the poor man's family decided they ought to "do something." They consulted a wise mental specialist, and finally decided to buy a very much smaller house than the former ones. Of course, he burned this one at the end of six months too. Thereupon his family bought a little log cabin with only one room. At the appointed date this also was burned. By this time, however, his family had decided to put the man into a sanitarium. There his mania was promptly cured.

It is not very difficult to stretch this odd episode to cover most of our "legislative cures" of to-day. A man has a mania for dishonest business. We shake our heads wisely and cut the size of his business in half by a "reform law." He is still dishonest. We cut down his business scope again and incidentally that of all the honest men at the same time. It is only after a good many sad failures that we wake up to the obvious truth and put the man in prison, where enforced meditation may work a real cure.

Now, the Church can use the confessional as a reform tool. She can pierce at once to the core of social disease, instead of inanely cutting off one privilege after another from really honest men. She can curb the abuse without limiting the just use of a natural right. She can exercise this sane, common-sense and effective influence over a great number in the community. But she can not exercise it over all. Over the hundreds of thousands of non-Catholics in this country she has no direct influence whatever. It is just at this point that the duty of the Catholic layman springs up. The layman comes in contact with people of every class. It is his support the Church demands. It is his personal direct influence on those immediately about him that must accomplish in the non-Catholic world what the confessional accomplishes for Catholics.

In these short papers I have sketched only in the vaguest outline some of the work to be done, a very few of the types of men and women we must meet, and a few possible ways of exerting our influence over them. I have mentioned a few of the mad homeopaths, but not all. Hundreds of high-minded, well-intentioned men and women are working blindly and without any sort of guidance to "uplift" society. And just because they are working blindly there is the utmost confusion and mutual contradiction in their methods. Writers, ministers, society dilettantes, labor agitators of all kinds, what are they but a very few types of those we must help.

And the poison-men, the real maniacs, the traitors to

*The last of a series of special articles.

our highest confidence and trust—there are thousands of them, and no two placed in the same condition with the same moral question to face. Whether we like it or not, the modern conditions, the excessive division of labor, and the more minute division of business responsibility absolutely demand a new specialized interpretation of the old staunch morality. Contracts between labor and capital that would have been just two hundred years ago are not just to-day. Either the position of the capitalist or the laborer has changed. One or the other is no longer economically free. That means an entirely new moral question. It demands a new application of the old law. It is not morality that is changing, but the things we must apply it to; and what this new application must be is the great message of the Church.

We, who happen to be of the laity, must carry this message clearly and forcefully. Our responsibility is tremendous, and it is also entirely new. At no time in Christian history have so many been outside the direct moral influence of the Church; and at no time have the economic and social conditions demanded more piteously, more desperately, just the firm, clear moral help the Church can give. It is time to awake! We have slept long enough while the Church has called. Our greatest chance has come. If we win, it is because the nobility and the unselfishness of our mission has inspired us; but if we lose, it is only because we have slept while the Church has undergone her greatest struggle of all time. Shall we sleep on? Or shall we awake?

RICHARD DANA SKINNER.

Inspiring Figures

A RENAISSANCE in the veneration of the Catholic women of the past is sorely needed. There was a reach, an exaltation, a wonderful love, a consuming flame of joy and devotion expressed in the old pictures and frescoes of the Holy Mother. It is lacking to-day. The modern world needs a touch of chivalry. The actuality of the Virgin-Mother should be accentuated, her young grace vivified. She was only a girl, scarce sixteen, when the Christ Child came, and the wondrous joy of a mother's love ran through and thrilled her being. Life sprang from life when that Boy smiled his first wee smile and a human, timid, faltering mother kissed his puckered mouth.

Clotilda, wife of Clovis, Queen of the Franks, should be rescued from a dim and hazy past and placed upon a new and brightened pedestal of homage. It was through her efforts that Christianity was given official recognition in the then pagan western world. The pageantry of kingly power must have appealed to that young girl, when first she left her mother's knee to find her fond barbaric lover. But steadfast and true, through the temptations of a conqueror's career she held her faith, till ultimately she saw her liege lord kneel in Christian prayer. Is it any wonder that those early folk wove fact and fancy into native song to preserve her sacred memory? Her husband cut his way through war to fame, she touched his life with glory. There is an opportunity for a skilful hand to freshen the outlines of the noble girl, and make her truly live again.

No mother of a wayward son can read of Monica without a tear. And she who prays, through the vigils of unending

nights, that God may guide his guilty feet to cleaner paths, is cheered to know that God must hear, as first He heard in other times, in far off lands that woman's pleading for her boy. There is more dramatic force in the battle of women as exemplified in the early life of St. Augustine than in any fiction ever staged.

Women of accomplishment in the hours of doubt and despair, can find no surer example of what one woman can do than in the accounts of St. Catherine of Siena. Of extraordinary personal charm, of boundless enthusiasms, of unfailing devotion, she is one of the most brilliant types of feminine power in history's book. With no particular training for the work, with no family of influence to support her, she became a commanding figure in the political, civic and religious life of medieval Italy.

The youth of most of these heroines appeals to the imagination. Joan of Arc was seventeen when she donned man's attire and led her troops against the English foe. Viewing her story as calmly and impartially as a Catholic can, there is still an irresistible appeal in the triumphs of the fair maid. The fighting spirit of any true man rises as he reads her history. He wants to bare his breast for the arrows her's received. He longs to bathe in blood that perfidious crew who burned her at the stake. Flippant high-school misses intent upon dance and dress might study her career with profit.

And what a call to sanctity there is in the biographies of St. Gertrude and St. Teresa. In one, the calmness of the Teuton mold, in the other the temperament of the South. Yet both were educated, enlightened, charming, high-bred ladies, not just black-robed, uninteresting women. Their lasting and immortal work cries out aloud for emulation.

And so, on every page of the story of Catholic women of the past, shines out the name of some great soul to cheer and brighten life's hard way. In the main, plain folk they were, of common clay, who lived and breathed and did life's ordinary things, but did them in an extraordinary way, not legendary myths, not stories told, but palpitating flesh and good red blood. Da Vinci could, if he were here, paint all their outlines fresh and new, and Raphael could infuse the soul. But they are gone. Yet how they loved those gentle folk!

WILLIAM H. LEARY.

The Future of Dalmatia

D ALMATIA is to the Serbian race what Brittany and Connaught are to the Celts. Its people, pushed to the seaboard by the inevitable advance of newer elements from the East, has kept a firm grip of its last stronghold and refused to be extinguished by Turk, Teuton or Latin. Like the Bretons and Western Irish, the Dalmatians are conservative and religious to an extreme degree. Like most seafarers their lives are bound up with the supernatural, and public acts of devotion to the Mother of God form a characteristic feature of their worship on shore. Naval experts commend the Dalmatians as the finest sailors in the world. Travelers speak of their simple, virtuous mode of life, and their generous hospitality to strangers. Dwellers among them remark on their piety, fidelity to Church rule, and peaceful disposition. They have been loyal subjects to the House of Hapsburg for many centuries, even though the call of the blood toward their brethren of an independent State has grown in strength with the decline of Turkish power in the Balkan Peninsula. In return for their loyalty the Dalmatians have no national concessions to register, such as Bohemia or Hungary managed to wrest from the Government of Vienna. Because of their very submission they were, perhaps, overlooked and despised. Although they made common cause with Croatia, they did

not share in the economic and cultural advantages granted to Croatians.

Dalmatia lacks schools and railways, but, dissatisfied with her isolation, the younger generation has of late sought instruction in Croatian or Serbian centers, thus strengthening links of kindred, and imbibing new ideas of freedom and autonomy. The victories of the Balkan wars fanned the ever-present fire of patriotism into flame. The long-standing allegiance to an alien crown faded in face of the inspiring spectacle of a Serb State triumphant over the Mohammedan power that had weakened and enslaved the race. Memories of the battles in which Catholics and Orthodox stood shoulder to shoulder in defence of Christianity, while the rest of Christendom stood cravenly aloof, were revived with enthusiasm, and Dalmatia, as well as Bosnia, pointed proudly to the number of her volunteers in the Serbian Army of 1912. It availed little that the Austrian authorities in Zara prohibited flags on which was inscribed merely the national proverb: *Brat je mio, koje vera bio!* (A brother is dear, no matter of what creed.) The sentiment of race brotherhood could not be eradicated although it might be outwardly suppressed. Painful episodes in which the clergy and their flocks came into opposition occurred throughout the district where Serbian propaganda had taken deepest root.

A struggle akin to what is taking place in Ireland disturbs and distresses the people of Dalmatia. Fealty to the Austrian Emperor, so long part and parcel of their religious existence, has not been laid aside lightly. Newer claims, however, based on an ancient medieval tie, have been put forward with a fiery intensity that has led to acts of violence and crime, repudiated by all factors alike. The Dalmatians should not be condemned for the lack of union. For some the path of duty seems to lie in adherence to the more recent past; for others it takes the form of ardent belief in a national resurrection from a more remote past, in which, before the Mohammedan invasion, Serbians enjoyed a brief, brilliant tenure of empire. Two parties, therefore, have arisen in Dalmatia.

The aspirations of the one, the Serbian party, are well voiced by Ivo Chippiko, a writer and patriot of whom his country is justly proud. He says:

We strain toward our Mother! The question of Dalmatia must not be kept in the background even now when so many larger issues are being debated. Strange views are enunciated in Italy. Do 180,000 Italians weigh more than 628,000 Serbians in Dalmatia? These Italians live in a compact mass in the towns where they have come to earn an existence in pursuits foreign to our own people. True, they are more advanced than we in many things, and their civilization has penetrated to a certain extent among us, but it has not affected the general character of our race. True, there are certain old monuments with the imprint of the Lion of Venice to be found on our shores, but what are these in comparison with the wishes of an entire nation? If architectural ruins are to be considered, Dalmatia may as well be Hungarian or Turk. If Italy pins her faith to monuments of stone, what of the Serbian Colony in her own Southern territory? Since the seventh century Dalmatia is in speech, custom and general character, a purely Serbian province. She has given birth to the oldest surviving Serbian literature as exemplified by the works of the poet Menchettich. In the seventeenth century, the poet Ivan Gundulitch was illustrious among Serbian writers. Dalmatia has never forfeited its right to self-government. But where can it find national freedom except in union with its race brethren? Under Italian rule the Serbs of Dalmatia would fare worse than under Austro-Hungarian rule. Nationality can never be stifled, and through the centuries Dalmatia has awaited a national awakening. The heroic figures of the sculptor Mestrovitch reveal the suffering and hope of a people worthy to live in freedom, and to obtain at last that toward which it has tended so long: reunion with the rest of the race. . . . How can we, despised of our masters, view unmoved the glorious epopee of our brothers in Serbia, where a short space of Christian freedom sufficed to give a small State

vigor and resolve to deliver Macedonia from the Turks? We, too, might have joined in the struggle and sacrifice, but we are forbidden to stretch our hands toward Serbia, our Mother. Nevertheless she remains our Mother, from whom we expect and shall obtain religious and every other freedom under the national flag.

The above question represents one party of the Southern Slav question. There is another, which deserves no less consideration. A strong Catholic element sees with misgiving the attraction of Dalmatians toward a land where Orthodoxy is the State creed, and where Catholicism has hitherto known neither grace nor favor. The group of patriotic Croats who find in allegiance to the Hapsburg dynasty not only a duty of conscience but the best safeguard for their faith have an earnest and respectable following among their countrymen. If less ardent and less ready to stake the future than the pronounced Serbophiles, they are determined to procure a better status for Dalmatia within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. They have succeeded in warding off the aggressive advance of Magyarism with its disintegrating concomitants of irreligion, and the corrupt morals due to Semitic ascendancy in the Government of Budapest. They have held close to Austria as their natural guardian against the insidious encroachment of Italy and the violent agitation of Serbia. They fear, not without reason, that Serbian intolerance of Austria's State religion is so deep-rooted that Catholics of any nationality will still encounter it within the boundaries of free Serbia, the Concordat notwithstanding. They know that Russian influence was never so potent in the Balkans as it is to-day, and Russia's attitude toward the Church does not inspire confidence. Dalmatians, loyal to Austria and solicitous for the preservation of religious liberty as well as for national reforms, look to the formation of a triune empire instead of a dual empire for the realization of their independence.

It is well known that the late Archduke Francis Ferdinand, a staunch opponent of Hungarian pretensions, favored this notion of creating a new Southern Slav kingdom that would revive the traditions of Agram and Raguse. These sons of Dalmatia who refuse to separate her cause from that of the throne to which she has so long been an appendage, are troubled, but not shaken by the tempting offers of a triumphant Serbia. They will resist incorporation until it is forced on them; and should the stream of race unity prove too strong, they will enter the young kingdom as a humane, cultural element with the mission of pacification and reconciliation. There is at this moment in Valjevo, a Serbian town devastated by the late Austrian invasion, a young Dalmatian priest who asked permission from the Serbian authorities to remain with the Austrian wounded and attend to their spiritual needs. Although twice laid prostrate by virulent attacks of *febris recurrens* he has endeared himself by his charitable activities to the entire population as well as to his immediate charge. Such men are new to Serbians, accustomed to suspect every figure in a cassock of political, imperialistic propaganda. The Concordat stipulates that the neophyte hierarchy of Serbia be drawn from non-Austrian nationalists, and this opens a field for ministrants of all other lands. While Dalmatia would, of course, retain its own clergy should it become united to Serbia, it is not likely that Dalmatian priests will be generally welcome in Serbia itself. The Swiss, Belgian, French or English clergy will have the preference, and this, let us hope, will have the effect of drawing wider attention to the needs and difficulties of the Church in Serbia. The best guarantee for the faithful fulfilment of every clause in the Concordat is the sympathetic interest of Catholics the world over in Serbian Catholicism, preserved and cherished through the vicissitudes of centuries by the staunch people of Dalmatia.

E. CHRISTITCH.

COMMUNICATIONS

Help for Destitute Mexicans

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I take pleasure in submitting the following report of relief work done during the past two months among destitute Mexicans on both sides of the Rio Grande, with money and supplies furnished by Catholics in the United States. We have actual record of 755 people who have received food and clothing, in and around Brownsville. Supplies sufficient for an equal number have been sent to interior points in Mexico from which no report is possible at this time. The Charity Home in Brownsville, a private institution under the management of a Catholic lady, has been supplied with medicines and clothing for 120 inmates or pensioners. The Convent of the Incarnate Word, where some of the refugee nuns from Mexico are now sojourning, has been furnished with supplies. A sum of money has been forwarded by a reliable messenger to Montemorelos where other nuns are reported to be in need. A box of infants' clothing has been forwarded to El Paso where special work is being done for mothers and babes. One young man who was entirely helpless has had medical attention, and in consequence is now able to work and support his mother and three orphan children depending on him. Since it is no longer possible for us to carry our work into the interior, we are giving more attention to refugees in the United States. This presents a problem scarcely less momentous and difficult than the one on the other side of the Rio Grande.

I wish to call the attention of Catholic young men to the young Mexican exiles among us. There are thousands of them, intelligent for the most part, educated and high-minded. They have had nothing to do with the political embroilment of their country. In the main they come directly from schools and colleges where they were in course of training for useful trades or professions. They have all the young man's eagerness for life and all the idealism of the Latins. They are not running away from duty or danger. Their patriotism is of the kind that makes martyrs, and they are enduring martyrdom daily. Their loyalty to one another, their efforts to maintain themselves honorably, their courage and cheerfulness, testify to sterling manhood. Here and there they are organizing for mutual assistance. Those who can get work divide with those who can not and they accept any employment that is offered. I frequently have an hour's delightful conversation in the evening with a young man who can read the Greek classics in the original. During the day he drives a bony horse to a rickety express wagon, for which he receives the wage of one dollar per day, which he conscientiously contributes to the common fund. They laugh at their privations and by one means and another keep up their courage. They have regular meeting places, where they assemble to read and talk, and to find the comfort and strength of companionship. But such pitifully bleak and cheerless places these are! A few boxes serve as tables, some broken chairs, and a shelf of tattered books and magazines. Their chief efforts are directed toward studying English, a knowledge of which is the first step toward securing employment. The best-equipped study hall I have seen has a few benches without books, a homemade blackboard and a dozen books of assorted kinds to be circulated among about forty students.

As I go among them they are always eager to hear about American young men, their ideals, their ambitions, their pleasures, and their methods of self development. While I try to tell them what I know there rises before my mind in vivid contrast, visions of recreation rooms, libraries, gym-

nasiums and all the aids and inspirations which are offered to the unfolding life of the American youth. I want the Catholic young men to take thought of these courageous young exiles, and out of their abundance send them help. I want money to buy books, and to furnish them with better facilities for helping themselves. They are undergoing the severest test that could be applied to them and they are measuring up to it like men. I have never heard a complaint, I have never seen anything except cheerful acceptance of their lot and gratitude for the asylum which is here afforded.

Considered from the point of numbers they constitute a large part of the numerical strength of the race. Considered from other standpoints they constitute the entire hope of the nation. But they have no official representatives to present their case before the tribunals of the world, they have no voice in the arbitration of affairs of great moment both to themselves and to their country. Nevertheless, some day they will go back home, and will become factors in the rebuilding of the nation. Let us give them something to take with them, something which will constitute a bond of brotherhood in the future.

Brownsville, Tex.

E. C. HENDRIX.

Catholics in the Y. M. C. A.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of March 13 the vanquisher of "an athletic fellow of twenty-five" seems to have scored a knock-out in the very first round of his interesting encounter. Yet his tactics and his blows won him a personal rather than an objective victory. He impeached the faith of his opponent but did not solve the obvious difficulty confronting a young Catholic who feels the need of physical gymnastics. To charge him with disloyalty and to cast suspicion upon his faith because he avails himself of the only means at hand to meet his legitimate need is unwarranted and reprehensible and beyond the point at issue. In his first Encyclical Pope Benedict XV said:

Again, let no private person, either by the publication of books or journals, or by delivering disclosures, publicly assume the position of a master in the Church. All know to whom God has given the teaching office in the Church; let him have the unrestricted right to speak as he thinks fitting when he wishes: it is the duty of others to tender him devout homage when he speaks and to obey his words. Concerning matters in which, since the Holy See has not pronounced judgment, saving faith and discipline, discussion may take place pro and contra, it is certainly lawful for everybody to say what he thinks and to uphold his opinion. But in such discussions let all intemperate language which may be seriously hurtful to charity be eschewed; let every one indeed maintain his own view freely, but let him do so modestly, and let him not imagine he is justified in casting suspicion on the faith or discipline of those who hold a contrary opinion simply because they differ from him.

We all know at whom the Pope's words were aimed and it is nowise stretching their import to apply them to the present controversy. Mr. Hume has presumed to pronounce sentence where the Church is silent. Such action is very much like setting oneself up as "a master in the Church." He brands as disloyal any and all Catholics who are affiliated in membership with the Y. M. C. A. The Holy See to whom is entrusted the guidance of the Church has issued no prohibition against such affiliation. Mr. McCloskey has a perfect right under the circumstances noted in his letter to avail himself of the privileges of his membership and Mr. Hume is expressly enjoined by the positive declaration of the Holy See from impeaching Mr. McCloskey's Catholicism or casting suspicion on his faith.

Mr. Hume's chief argument against an "athletic young fellow" is not any sounder than his unwarranted attack on the young man's loyalty. Stated universally it would read: "No Catholic

can be loyal to his faith and retain his self respect who joins a voluntary organization or society from the higher offices of which Catholics are excluded." The proposition is not universally true nor does it accord with the historical toleration of the Church which, though always aiming primarily at the spiritual welfare of the faithful, does not curtail heedlessly their material opportunities. The application of the proposition to a civil society will establish its falsity. A Catholic native of the United States forswears his allegiance and becomes a naturalized British subject for the sole purpose of assuring better protection for his interests vested in foreign countries. His aim is purely material. The Catholic Church does not prohibit his change of citizenship. Yet by so doing he voluntarily affiliates himself with a civil society whose chief ruler and other high functionaries can not be Catholics. Moreover not only is his religion tabooed by statutory provision in the highest hereditary office and in various appointive positions, but a portion of the taxes which he is compelled to pay annually is employed directly for the sustenance and propagation of the State religion which is avowedly anti-Catholic. Such a naturalized British subject justly resents the charge that he is lacking in loyalty to his faith or in self respect. He would contend that his action was practically sound though admitting of theoretical objections.

Similarly the large Catholic membership of the Y. M. C. A. should be considered not only theoretically but practically. Its elimination will not be accomplished by sarcastic criticism and wholesale impeachment of the large number of Catholic young men of whom Mr. McCloskey is a representative. It is not my purpose to defend the Y. M. C. A. But its vast Catholic membership calls for fair and honest investigation. Its cause should be clearly determined. The question is not whether a loyal Catholic can be an associate member, but rather why are there so many loyal Catholics enrolled in the Y. M. C. A.? It must exert a strong appeal to produce so large a response. There must be a real need for some such organization. Otherwise it would not prevail over parental objection and the maturer applicant's own reluctance. The challenging tone and the rashness of Mr. McCloskey's letter furnish more than a ready handle for severe arraignment and sharp retort. They indicate a deep conviction of the justice and rectitude of his position. No true solution of the young man's difficulty, no fair response to his challenge will overlook the causes of his confidence. He is evidently in the dilemma of foregoing his accustomed exercise or retaining his membership. He has thousands of coreligionists with him in the same or in a similar predicament. It is to his credit and not reproach that he regrets the failure to make provision for himself and others in the Catholic scheme of social and fraternal organization. He represents a very real and a very earnest type of the young Catholic who has imbibed some of the principles of the so-called modern progress. Cleanliness, physical exercise and health are the chief slogans of the new order which tends to overemphasize their importance and relegate the virtues of the spirit to the background. The views of the apostles of the health gospel may be exaggerated, but athletics and gymnastics are not to be wholly pooh-poohed. They have a recognized place in the curriculum of our schools, colleges and universities; and experience teaches that besides the positive moral and physical advantages accruing from their use they have a wide negative effect that consists in engrossing the interest and dissipating the purely physical energies of boys and young men.

With the almost universal application of machinery, and the congestion of large populations in the cities, great numbers of men have been transferred from the farm to the factory and counting-room. To preserve their health there is urgent need of a substitute for the open-air physical labors that brought their ancestors home at night, wearied in limb and muscle after a long day's toil.

Mr. McCloskey and his fellows are the victims of a changed economic order. They are not disloyal Catholics. They are sufferers because of some one's neglect, lack of foresight or indifference. Nevertheless Mr. McCloskey has done a real service toward the solution of the problem by openly avowing the reasons for his membership in the Y. M. C. A. He has made himself a target for severe criticism. But no attack leveled at him can fail to penetrate into the real causes of his predicament. No fair-minded man can hear the faith of a Catholic member of the Y. M. C. A. called into question without adverting to the folly of ignoring the needs and demands of athletic young men, and praying God to speed the day when those demands will be met.

Meanwhile let no one hurl his private anathemas at our Catholic youth who venture, often reluctantly, into the precincts of the Y. M. C. A. The Holy See, which is the divinely appointed custodian of the faith of old and young, has not forbidden their entrance. In that wise spirit of toleration which recognizes the difficulties confronting her members the Church permits membership in associations like the Y. M. C. A., provided there is no proximate danger to faith or morals. The Church in her wisdom has not been convinced that such danger exists, and she denies emphatically to any private Catholic the right to impeach the faith or discipline of those of her members who avail themselves of her tacit permission to join the Y. M. C. A. In keeping with her spirit and her express command the opponents of the Y. M. C. A. should confine themselves to criticism of that organization, and refrain from abusing or questioning the faith and loyalty of its Catholic members.

J. A. FARRELL.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of March 13 there is a letter from Leo Paul McCloskey under the title "Catholics in Y. M. C. A." His enunciation of the principal arguments urged against Catholics joining the Y. M. C. A. omits one of grave importance, namely, frequenting an occasion of danger. I would suggest that no one should count on his ability to resist attempts upon his faith. Overconfidence in our own strength often makes us a victim of our opponent's sword. It is idle to think that God's graces are nearer to one in the swimming pool of a Y. M. C. A. than in the teaching of Holy Mother Church, and in the associations fostered and encouraged by her ministers. Far better is it to take one's soul before God all lustrous, albeit the modest family tub furnish the only medium for aquatic exercise, than to go to judgment worn and wounded by a life-long resistance to the proselyting influence of the Y. M. C. A. A splendidly developed physique is but a poor compensation for the sacrifice.

I take it that our friend is not in sympathy either with the A. O. H. or the K. of C. of his home town. Can it be presumed, that, while he has been blessed with the faculty of observation to such extent as to discover the discrepancies between what these two great Catholic societies have accomplished and what they should accomplish, he does not realize the opportunity thus presented to brain and brawn? Doesn't he see an opportunity to become "the man of the hour"? If he has not, so far, identified himself with either, or both, of these admirable organizations, should he not now do so, and bend his mental and physical efforts toward bringing to pass those things which will draw his Catholic brothers, and all men, toward a happy eternity and in the meantime give them the best that this temporal life can afford?

Yea, my friend Leo, now that you have discovered a condition that needs the injection of brain and brawn, sit not idly by and complain. It has been given to you to uncover a lamentable state of affairs. Yours also is the complementary duty of making an effort to interest Catholic men in your proposal. Knowing the A. O. H. and K. of C. as I know them, I am sure that if

you can prove to them the advantages of the plan you advocate, you will find a fertile field for effort.

Monmouth, Ill.

JOHN J. RYAN.

The Physician's Angel

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The announcement of a retreat for physicians at St. Vincent's hospital, New York City, recalls the fact that St. Raphael is the patron of physicians, surgeons and nurses. Was there ever a time in human history when his assistance was more needed than to-day? Yet he is not known, he is not invoked by our Catholic medical corps as he should be. Some years ago, the writer's attention was called to this subject by a medical man who was highly successful in his profession. In his consulting rooms, that time-honored piece of furniture for a physician, the bust of Æsculapius, had no place. Instead, there was a statue of St. Raphael, before which burned a perpetual taper. Of course it provoked comment and observation. No man lets his light shine, without the world being aware of it; but so much the better. Observation brings inquiry, and inquiry brings knowledge, and knowledge brings wisdom. I, myself, was of those to ask, and to learn. It appeared that a certain French vicar-general of Clermont, the Abbé Chardon, had left us a book too little known, entitled "The Memoirs of a Seraph." We are there told that St. Raphael signifies in Hebrew "Physician of God—healing of God." (St. Gregory. Hom. 34):

It is he that makes known to men so many and simple remedies. Many others would be revealed to physicians and men of science if, less puffed up with pride, they would condescend to have recourse to them with humility. Happy among men is the physician of intelligence and faith who will appreciate the aid placed at his disposal by the physician of God. He will show himself grateful. He will reserve a place of honor in his dwelling for a statue of Raphael. Morning and evening he will salute the heavenly patron of his science. Nor will he begin his studies, or go to visit the sick without glancing toward him and invoking him: Come to my aid, O Spirit, Friend of man! By communicating thy wonderful secrets enlighten my ignorance; give wisdom to my determinations; give steadiness to my incertitude; prevent mistakes; second my care; work the cure. May all my art through thee become charity; and may every consolation procured for the poor sick make them praise God.

Is not this the perfect prayer of humility and faith for our physicians, surgeons and nurses? Æsculapius is a memory, a shade. St. Raphael is a hope, a living power. The materialistic man of science would reverse these facts. Having, perhaps, no more superstition than faith, he would call upon the memory of the dead to aid him. The memory of Æsculapius is, he implies, by the bust in his consulting rooms, an inspiration to trust in his own powers. Vain confidence. Usually, his bust is dusty, and more or less soiled. No votive lamp illuminates its dumb outlines; no importunate prayer invokes that assistance.

The Abbé Chardon does not refrain from condemning the Catholic physician, surgeon or nurse who neglects to obtain the cooperation of so powerful a friend. Could any act be more reasonable and simple on the part of a Christian who believes in the efficacy of prayer? We are not of those who declare that science is belittled or retarded by Christian faith, because we are eye-witnesses of the contrary effects, having all our lives lived under a roof where science is pursued. Once when a Pure Food and Drug Law was to be sought from a State unfriendly to it, a man of science, unaccustomed to such public speaking, appeared before the House of Representatives. Without oratory, or gesture, to assist him, without lobbying or obvious "supporters," he stated, in plain language, the scientific importance of this law. At the close of his brief address, there was not one vote opposed to his proposition. He had prayed before the Blessed Sacrament that this might be so, before he took an early train to the Capitol.

"Here lies Pasteur," we read above a mausoleum which is an altar in Paris. This statement is simple, and would stand alone; but it may be expanded into the history of a life of scientific labor that has thus far no equal in the world. Louis Pasteur looms unabashed the Christian man of science *par excellence* in the records of such achievements. He has standardized that field as men of business now talk of "standardizing" their trades. Nor is it the Church alone that thus proclaims him. The State, that elusive, tyrannical, exacting entity, for once agrees with the Church in this decision. By unanimous consent, this man of God, this friend of the suffering body, is humanly speaking, one of the Immortals. Shall the modern physician, surgeon or nurse hesitate to follow in his steps of faith?

Is it not to the eternal glory of the Church that she permits no chloroform or ether to be administered until after the Sacraments have been received? One may witness these things any day in a Catholic hospital. In their linen over-slips and white-winged cornettes, the assisting nurses stand near the operating table, with hands meekly folded, in silent prayer. The surgeon, cone in hand, bows his head. The patient, having previously received the Sacraments of the Church, St. Raphael is invoked. But a moment, and the sign to proceed is made. Usually the patient wakes, in an hour or two, to convalescence. If not, a Christian soul has gone forth, not alone, afraid and helpless, but conducted by St. Raphael to a life and a country eternal and full of glory. May St. Raphael attract and enlighten our physicians, surgeons and nurses, not only on the battlefields of Europe to-day, but in our cities and homes of the peaceful world.

Chester Springs, Pa.

E. S. CHESTER.

The "Outlook's" Suggestions

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Discussing the measures recently proposed in Congress to authorize exclusion of scurrilous and libelous publications from the mails the *Outlook* says:

If the Roman Catholic Church finds itself assailed by scurrilous and libelous publications, as we think is the case, it should pursue the course which other persons pursue when they are similarly assailed. It should either bring a suit for libel against the publisher, or it should take measures to have the publishers criminally indicted by a grand jury and punished under the general law. That this is not an unpracticable remedy in a free State is very clearly brought out by one witness before the Congressional Committee to which these bills for the establishment of a censorship of the press have been referred. Cardinal Newman was brought up in England for trial for defaming Father Achilli who had left the Roman Catholic Church for the Protestant communion as Cardinal Newman had left the Protestant Church for the Roman Catholic communion. He was convicted of a libel and was mulcted to the extent of 12,000 English pounds or \$60,000. The *Outlook* quite agrees with Dr. G. F. Williams who stated these facts to the committee that they show that the existing laws are quite sufficient to protect the Roman Catholic Church and its priests and clergy from any scurrilous and libelous attacks which may be made against them by unscrupulous partisan journals.

The "Catholic Encyclopedia" (Vol. X, p. 797) thus gives the real facts of the Newman-Achilli trial.

An apostate Italian priest, Achilli, was haranguing against the Church. Prompted by Wiseman, the Oratorian gave particulars of this man's infamous career, and Achilli brought a charge of libel. Newman at enormous expense, collected evidence which fully justified the accusations he had made. But a no-popery jury convicted him. He was fined £100; on appeal, the verdict was quashed; and the *Times* admitted that a miscarriage of justice had taken place when Newman was declared guilty.

Now, applying these facts—which are facts—to the case of one of the human polecats of the *Menace* or of any other of the publications which the *Outlook* so sternly calls "un-

scrupulous partisan journals," we see that all a libeled priest has to do is to publish the facts about the polecat, get sued for libel, spend some thousands of dollars in preparing the case, be convicted, have his conviction quashed on appeal and then secure a triumphant vindication, with a possible chance that the *Outlook* may finally admit that his original conviction was not wholly justified, and that the polecat was an "unscrupulous partisan." What more could any one want? In the light of the real facts of the Newman-Achilli trial as told by Doctor William Barry in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," it is worth while studying the version contributed by Dr. G. F. Williams, with which the *Outlook* "quite agrees" as quoted above. Bad scholarship and bad logic are, it is true, almost invariably found in company with the "strictly Protestant" point of view and the reason is not far to seek. But one can not help wondering who it is that cooks up the extraordinary travesties of fact which one runs across from time to time and of which this *Outlook*-Dr. Williams' instance is a good sample. Where is this kind of history made? Can it be in some of the "universities" which turn out those innumerable "D.D.'s" who are so plentiful in the land in these days?

Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK.

"America" in Catholic Colleges

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Many schemes have been proposed to spread the influence of the Catholic press, but it seems to me that AMERICA itself in its present campaign to get the National Catholic Weekly into every Catholic college and high school, has proposed the most feasible of all. That young men in college and high school read AMERICA and enjoy it is a proof of the readability of the paper. Here in Holy Cross College over three hundred boys are following each week's contents with the greatest interest. A large number of the boys at Brooklyn College, New York, are also reading your Review every week. This custom was introduced into these two colleges by teachers who had in view the present improvement of the boys, and who were desirous also of introducing them early to the discussion of problems that fall within the province of lay activity. Into the ranks of the active laymen we want our boys to enter from the very start.

The task of getting boys at Holy Cross interested in AMERICA has not been difficult. In the first place the active work of selling the copies to the students was entrusted to two popular seniors. Then the professors spoke of the publication in the classroom in a casual way, and in some cases assigned them work and the drafting of speeches from topics handled in the current issue of the Review. These several methods, coupled with an active appreciation of the paper by the professors themselves, who often spoke in their classes regarding timely and important articles in the week's issue, made a strong impression on the student mind. It is our earnest hope that once the student has become familiar with the paper, he will always feel its need, and desire long acquaintance with the best in Catholic journalism.

With the new campaign to get all Catholic students in our Catholic schools and colleges throughout the country reading AMERICA, it would seem that all Catholic teachers should be in sympathy. It is not hard to awaken interest. The price is no longer prohibitive, as almost every boy can find five cents a week for his copy if he cares to do so. We teachers must show the way and make it our aim to lead the boy to such a desire. For the most part boys are not unwilling to take an interest in questions of the day. All they need is a little instruction on the obligation incumbent on every educated Catholic of keeping informed on topics that are en-

gaging public attention, especially in the bearing on Catholic interests. They soon find that the task is not so dry as at first appeared. May we soon hear that other Catholic colleges in the country are doing what Holy Cross is doing for the Catholic press, namely, disposing weekly of more than one hundred copies of AMERICA to the students!

Worcester, Mass.

F. C. W.

The Metamorphosed Russian

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Readers of AMERICA who have followed affairs in the Near East with more than casual interest must have regarded with surprise, and even bewilderment, the pen-picture of "The Russian Soldier" which appeared in its pages a few weeks ago. The paper besides being well written and readable was evidently based on intimate, first-hand knowledge, not only of the Tsar's fighting-machine but also of the stock from which it is recruited—the Russian peasant. It was precisely this quality of genuineness and actuality in the essay of E. Christich that occasioned deep perplexity in some quarters.

Obviously the article was intended to be an unqualified eulogy of the Russian soldier, the Russian peasant, and of the Russian character in general. The peasant of the Empire is depicted as being a spiritual, devout, supernatural, frugal, ascetic, charitable, compassionate, humble, obedient and docile agrarian idealist. A combination of virtues that would render him a rare ornament in any community, Slavic or Teutonic. But if he is this compound of amiability he is assuredly worthy of far better treatment than is generally accorded him by the scholars, travelers and ethnologists who have studied him on his native heath and then recorded their findings in the pages of contemporaneous history. Their reports run altogether counter to the glowing description of his latest very able apologist. Thus, for example, E. Christich says in "The Russian Soldier":

The bulk of the Russian army is made up of peasants, and therefore it is a religious, loyal, docile, devout, humane body of men, for all these qualities distinguish the Russian peasant. The mainspring of his life is a supernatural force. . . . Frugal, ascetic, charitable, devout, the *Mujik* is very close to the Christian ideal. No other Christian race has so spontaneously assimilated the Christian teaching of poverty, humility and renunciation.

Yet the "Catholic Encyclopedia," to which "E. C." is a contributor, says, vol. XIII, p. 233, sq.:

Statistics show a continual increase of criminality in Russia, due to the increase of population, the dissemination of socialistic and revolutionary ideas among the lower classes, the want of culture and the lack of moral influence of the Orthodox religion. [Here follows a long list of statistics.] The highest percentage of criminals is furnished by the peasants. . . . Political criminality has increased there to an alarming degree. . . . The seminaries both morally and intellectually are in a wretched condition; from these seminaries the moral and intellectual shortcomings of the Russian clergy are derived, their students as a rule entering the priesthood without the least vocation. . . . This clergy exercises its ministry over more than ninety millions of Orthodox faithful; but it is rendered incapable of accomplishing its mission by poverty, want of education, the lack of sound vocations, the oppression of the Government, contempt and social isolation, family cares, and not infrequently by drink. Only in the cities are there to be found priests of culture and in comfortable circumstances; those who work in the rural parishes are deserving of pity and compassion.

The conclusion from all this is patent. The whole history of religious experience demonstrates that if the shepherds be such, it is morally impossible for the sheep to be "religious, devout, ascetic," with "the mainspring of his life a supernatural force"!

However much he may wish to believe the best about his

fellow-men, the lover of truth will be hard put to it to reconcile these and certain other discrepancies that rear themselves like a barbed wire entanglement between the historical Russian and the mystical, dreaming idealist that graced AMERICA's pages a while ago. Paradox peeps o'er paradox and inconsistencies on inconsistencies arise. And strangest of all is the puzzle furnished by a comparison between previous articles of E. Christich and this latest appreciation of Ivan. For example, within less than a twelvemonth, March 14, 1914, there appeared in AMERICA an essay entitled "The Russian Advance" by the author of "The Russian Soldier." This particular subject had at the time an especial interest for the present writer, as he was then less than a day's journey from the Russian frontier. The paper was, in substance, a sharp cry of warning from "E. C." to the nations of Europe against the "Russian peril" which "like an octopus" is creeping relentlessly forward, threatening before long to lay the whole English-speaking world prostrate under its domination! England in particular is warned of the peril; her "supine indifference" in the face of the steady stream of Russian emigration through Turkestan, with Russia all the while "surreptitiously" increasing her army, is scornfully characterized by "E. C." as downright cowardice. In fine, the whole tenor, intent and atmosphere of this contribution is the flat negation of all that "The Russian Soldier" stands for! A single example must suffice, though they might be multiplied.

In "The Russian Soldier," speaking of Russia's limited army, and the total absence of militarism, "E. C." says:

"Another cause for the limitation is the non-martial character of the people, the most restful, inaggressive people in the world." In "The Russian Advance" we read:

No more striking change in the trend of international politics has taken place within the last decade than the tacit acceptance of Russian expansion, etc. . . . Turn whither we will the spectacle of Russia creeping forward confronts us, materially in Asia, politically in Europe. . . . Friends of liberty and tolerance the world over will hope that it (the absorption of smaller States like Persia) be deferred until the great Muscovite Empire has reached a higher grade in her cultural evolution. . . . Russia is creating a sphere of influence in Hungary itself, and from Alaska to Suedo-Finnish ground, from the Urals to the Baltic, she stretches like an octopus. (AMERICA, vol. X, p. 540.)

And yet with this warning ringing in our ears that the Russian bear "is overwhelming the world," we are invited to remember that this race is "the most restful, inaggressive people in the world"!

But still one's wonder grows, for in AMERICA for May 10, and 17, 1913, appears another, longer contribution from the pen of E. Christich. These two papers entitled, "The Rule of the Romanoffs" were inspired by the jubilee of the Romanoff dynasty in 1913, its tercentenary. They are anything but complimentary either to the Romanoffs or to their ideals, which have of necessity become the dominating factor in Russian life. Put side by side with "The Russian Soldier" these documents add to our perplexity. For example we read in "The Russian Soldier":

The Russian soldier's greatcoat is spacious, for he likes plenty of room and full freedom of movement. Neither is his soul stunted by cast-iron rules, meticulous observances of non-essential details or the systematic harshness that drives to suicide. Between officer and man there is human dealing, mutual tolerance and the sense of solidarity that actuates all Slavs without regard to caste. . . . Everything in Russia is big, etc., etc. . . .

In "The Rule of the Romanoffs" we read: "Romanoff liberty is an article for export only. . . . In Russia the preachers of liberalism find their way to Siberia, and religious freedom is a fiction." These last statements are, of course, absolutely unimpeachable, as the writer then goes on to show by specific

references to the insidious and systematic persecution of the Catholic Church which has not relaxed for three hundred years. There are thirteen million Catholics in Russia, we might remark in passing, despite the fact that a Catholic priest is punished by being driven into exile if he dares to admit a convert to the Sacraments.

Finally, not to multiply the puzzling paradoxes, "E. C." says, in "The Russian Soldier":

He depends on moral and not on material help to attain his end. Because he possesses his soul, the Russian soldier knows no defeat. . . . At a massed parade on Morsova Polya, outside Petrograd, I saw a body of stolid-looking recruits break their lines and rush toward the Tsar as soon as he appeared, hurrahing and waving their caps in a manner certainly not learned at drill. . . . They had only just come from their villages and could not control their excitement at finding themselves in proximity to the person of the Tsar.

Obviously the purpose of this is to prove that the Russian soldier "possessing his soul" is not a military automaton, but, that man for man he stands, fellow even with the Tsar in "that solidarity that actuates all Slavs without regard to caste." Yet, the same writer, in "The Rule of the Romanoffs" defends a thesis which is absolutely the contrary:

Nothing is plainer, nevertheless, than that the Tsar is never considered on an equality with the rest of humanity. His vaunted familiarity with the poorest *Mujik* may be gauged from the following verbatim translation of the peasants' address in the recent jubilee celebrations.

"E. C." then quotes the address to prove that Russian "equality" is a myth. One could hardly have found a better confirmation of a pet theory, for the document is a piteous specimen of that absolute servility of spirit which furnishes the groundwork of a despotism. The poor peasants who spoke such lines, i.e.—potential Russian soldiers—plainly possessed neither body nor soul of their own. They are but units in relentless autocracy, mere ciphers in a horde.

Small wonder, then, that we are bewildered in this maze of contradiction. Surely, objective truth remains ever the same, one and indivisible. But perhaps it is the subjective viewpoint that has veered to meet the exigencies of—war? Whom are we to believe, E. Christich or E. Christich?

E. A. W.

Gothic Vestments

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I read with pleasure the letter published in your issue of February 27 in reference to the so-called "Gothic" vestments, and I hope our Catholic clergy will bring them into use again. In what Pugin called the "Ages of Faith" they were, I believe generally, if not universally, in use, and have been used in quite recent years; here in Philadelphia there is a church that had a set, which the pastor told me was kept for the greater festivals. But besides their superior beauty as compared with the stiff vestments now commonly used, they also symbolize Our Lord hanging on the Cross, for the "Gothic" chasuble has the transverse bars, placed not at a right angle, but at an angle of about 45 degrees with the upright, thus symbolizing the position of the arms of Our Lord as He hung upon the Cross. One has only to look at any crucifix and this will then be apparent. The Cross is represented in this way not only on the back of the chasuble, but also on the front, and will call to mind what the author of the "Imitation of Christ" says about a priest vested for Mass and going to the altar: that he bears the Cross of Christ on his breast and also on his back.

Philadelphia.

H.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1915

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLIN;
Treasurer, JOHN D. WHEELER.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$8.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00 (16s.)

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York City, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Contributions for the Mexican fund may be sent direct to AMERICA.

Boston and a Bargain

THE plain man might well inquire what it was that drew together at Boston—as jarring discords resolve in a harmonious concord—such divergent elements as two bishops of the Episcopal Church, a bishop of the Methodist Church, the “unknown presbyter” of Boston, Rose Kelly, upon whom the Catholics “practised electricity,” and Dorothy Nichols, sometime inmate of the House of the Good Shepherd. The answer is that Rome brought them together; or, to be more explicit, a common antagonism to Catholics made them forget for the time being the many causes of disunion that divide them. In a world of uncertainty there is considerable comfort in knowing that whatever else may be doubtful, Rome is always wrong. Hence the Protestant divines and Rose Kelly and Dorothy Nichols, sometime inmate of the House of the Good Shepherd.

It is extremely probable that Miss Kelly's acquaintance with electricity is as slight as her acquaintance with Jesuits, whom she conceives as a species of underground clergymen, devoting their lives to producing shocks. On such a count her testimony, so far as it regards the amendment “respecting an establishment of religion,” may be taken as passing. But Bishops Lawrence and Babcock, and the Rev. W. H. Van Allen, as members of a Church that is in communion with the English Protestant Reformed Religion as by Law Established, know with all certainty that nothing is more remote and far from probability than that the Catholic Church is ever likely to become the established religion of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or of the United States. Yet an absurd clause to this effect finds a place in the amendments proposed to prohibit appropriations for “sectarian” purposes.

Having begun with universals, it was a simple matter for the proponents to descend to particulars. Hence, under the generalship of Mrs. Susan E. Stevens, a lady of the place, an attack was made upon Catholic institutions in general, and the Houses of the Good Shepherd in particular. We have no brief to apologize for the Houses of the Good Shepherd, they need no apology. It is established beyond dispute, both in England and in America, among Catholics and Anglicans, that the only rescue work of any lasting value is that carried on by religious. If, out of the vast number of inmates of such homes in this country, Mrs. Stevens should have found two to back up her hysterical charges, her contentions are simply disproved by pointing to the considerable majority who do not testify for her. “Hell-holes” was the name the lady gave, with an alliterative turn, to the Houses of the Good Shepherd, which, after all, is true in a sense. For they may be likened to holes to which many a fallen woman creeps from the pit of hell, down which she was slipping rapidly, into the sunshine of forgiveness and grace radiating from the lives of those who have taken for their pattern, the Good Shepherd Who gave His life for the sheep. The riches of the world could not purchase for one hour one such consecrated life; but if an appropriation of the Massachusetts State funds helps to lift the burden ever so lightly, no blame will attach to the two Protestant bishops, the “unknown presbyter” of Boston, Rose Kelly and Dorothy Nichols, the sometime inmate of the House of the Good Shepherd. A goodly company this. It should be incorporated for the protection of morals, especially truth, chastity and the prevention of the practice of electricity. Apparently the Right Reverend Fathers in the Lord could withstand all shocks administered by their experienced associates, Rose Kelly and Dorothy Nichols, sometime inmate of the House of the Good Shepherd, and Pilate and Herod would be reconciled once again.

Brother Anthony

IN the death of Brother Anthony, New York has lost a friend and benefactor. For more than a quarter of a century he gave the best of his varied and cultivated powers to the higher education of her children. He was not content to give money to the betterment of our city, but he gave, what is far more precious, both the golden and the silver years of his life. As long ago as 1870 he was occupying the chair of English literature in Manhattan College, and from that time on until the day of his death, with some few interruptions when superiorships engaged him elsewhere, he continued to preside over the various institutions of higher learning which are conducted by the Christian Brothers in New York City. How profoundly he influenced Catholic life may still be seen in the very evident marks of his training left on many of the city's most loyal and most fervent Catholic homes. It was inevitable that he should have done so,

for he was a Christian gentleman of the old type, kindly, courteous, courtly and courageous. His learning, his self-control, his high ideals were an inspiration to many hundreds of young men. Nor have they ceased with his death. They have been perpetuated in countless instances, where those who came under his influence felt themselves moved to make their lives noble with a strong, fearless, uncompromisingly loyal Catholic manhood such as his. Careers like his are all too rare; their memory should be kept alive.

"Non-Sectarian Ethics"

THE November-December *Bulletin* of the High School Teachers' Association, New York City, may be said to have been made in Germany; and to that extent it was made well. One article explains the selection of reading texts in German secondary schools, which is determined primarily by their moral worth and character-making power, and only secondarily by their literary value; another fills half the issue with an account of the vocational and continuation schools of Munich, the best type of the system of secondary education that obtains throughout the German empire. Henry E. Fritz, Ph.D., was one of twenty-five American teachers who went to Germany to study its school system, and this article is the result of his observations. Having sketched with keen appreciation the practical purpose and methods and masterly efficiency of the German vocational schools and their skilful application of academic subjects to the training of serviceable and patriotic citizens, the professor describes one evening's class-work in detail. An hour each is given to shop theory and mathematics, to history and civics and the science of machinery, and to German literature. So far our American teacher is in enthusiastic accord, but then follows one hour on "Religion," and here he balks. Protestants and Jews were transferred to sections where their respective religions were taught, a procedure which might, but does not, excite the American's admiration. Electing to remain with the Catholics, he hears the students explain the meaning of Faith, the Christian, Mosaic and natural laws, the Godhead of Christ and the powers He gave His Church, the three parts of the Mass, and a section of Church history—certainly a full and profitable hour; but he is not satisfied. "What a fine opportunity," he laments, "was here, after the practical lesson on veneers, to teach non-sectarian ethics in relation to veneers!"

But despite the lost opportunity their educational system, rigidly sectarian though it be, has, he insists, made the German people "happy, contented with little, industrious, honest, thrifty, yet wealthy," while "unemployment and poverty had almost disappeared." Surely, then, they could dispense with "non-sectarian ethics"; yet the perverse conclusion our American brings back with him is: "We must sooner or later introduce non-sectarian ethics into all the schools of the United States

to counteract the tendency toward lawlessness of which American teachers complain." But why not introduce that which has proved its ability to counteract this tendency rather than an undefined something which never did? He would have the teacher expound "the wickedness of selling veneers for solid wood." But suppose the student asks why this is wicked? He will find an adequate answer only in the laws of God, natural and revealed; which will at once whisk him out of the shadowy land of "unsectarian ethics" into Church and Bible and positive Christianity.

The Munich student was there already. He had learned in the hour of "Religion" the wickedness of false veneers, and the source and limits of all other wickedness, and its penalties, and the sanctions and rewards of righteousness. The German Government had taken care of that. The December *Studies* thus summarizes the system:

In every school the Imperialized curriculum has provided for every scholar a definite and denominational plan of religious instruction extending over the whole nine years; an integral part of the official course, taught at the expense of the State by trained teachers, Catholic, or Lutheran, or Calvinist, or Hebrew, as each scholar required; amply provided for in point of time; the leading subject in the official time-table; not a separate branch, nor unofficial annex, but in the express words of the Prussian State Code, "an essential part of the general organization of the school, not holding a separate or isolated position, but closely bound up in active correlation with all branches of the school work which aim at culture and education."

The secondary teacher passes an examination in philosophy and pedagogy, languages and literature, *religious knowledge* and "general professional fitness." Religion, then, positive and denominational, is an essential part of the system which our American visiting teachers have found so efficient in Germany. This, and not the vague and foundationless ethics that we have already tried and found wanting, is what will counteract lawlessness and build up a God-fearing and law-respecting people. The religious knowledge prescribed would also greatly benefit the teachers.

Save Me from My Friends

IT is a curious, though common phenomenon, that people who have spent their energies in attacking the Catholic Church and its principles, and feign to regard it as dead, or moribund, or at any rate negligible as a world force, will suddenly wake up and complain that it does not exert the very power whose existence they had been denying. Abandoning the faith and teaching of his youth, M. Maeterlinck has glorified the intelligence of birds and horses, and immortalized unintelligent sentient beings at the expense of the immortality of the human soul as expounded by the Catholic Church. Thereby he won socialistic, materialistic, anti-Catholic, anti-Christian plaudits, and not a little cash profit, but forfeited the support of the statesmen, priests and people who, for the last thirty years, the period of his propaganda, have upbuilt

the Belgian Government and nation. As a Government and a people Belgium has stood boldly and effectively for the very things that Maeterlinck repudiated, and thereby it has attained preeminence industrially, socially, religiously, educationally and morally among self-governing nations. During all that period it stood, and still stands, unflinchingly by the Catholic Church and its Head; and now this apostate Fleming, who writes French plays, has the impudence to denounce the Pope for not exerting the authority of which he had always denied him the possession. The report of his tirade is as follows:

ROME, March 15.—Maurice Maeterlinck, the Belgian author, who is attempting to stir up a pro-Ally sentiment by lectures throughout Italy, to-day made a savage attack on the Vatican for maintaining a neutral attitude in the war. He declared that the Holy See in taking this position has abandoned the teachings of Jesus Christ.

The silly charge is proved false by a better Belgian authority than Maeterlinck. Mgr. de Wachter, Bishop Auxiliary to Cardinal Mercier, has written:

His Holiness, Pope Benedict XV, has expressed his entire satisfaction as well as his paternal sympathy with our great Cardinal Archbishop of Malines. The powers of evil would like to make mischief between Catholic Belgium and the Holy See, but they will not succeed. Later on irresistible proof of the Sovereign Pontiff's profound and complete sympathy with our unhappy country and its courageous and eminent prelate will be made public.

Later it will also appear that the anti-Christian propaganda of M. Maeterlinck and his friends have quite other objects in view than the interests of Belgium or of Italy, and that the Pope, in acting impartially as the loving father of all nations and peoples, has wisely safeguarded the interests of both. Maeterlinck's attacks are reported to have angered many Italian friends of the Allies. The form of the propaganda assumed by him and his anti-Christian confrères might well elicit the cry: "Save me from my friends!"

"Pseudochromesthesia"

SOUNDS like a dreadful malady, but according to Dr. Coriat it is not so alarming as it seems. The word is merely the short name for the disease—or should we not say the gift?—of hearing colors. He had a woman patient, reports the Boston *Transcript*, to whom the name "Nellie," for instance, suggested pale blue: "Lucy" a clear sapphire, "Bertha" a deep Prussian blue. Long *a* she described as a "cool" sound; long *e* a "high, cool sound"; purple depressed her, and green produced a feeling of discontent. This remarkable woman could also "taste" beautiful colors, and she had a fellow-patient in whom "Each type of pain produced its individual and invariable color, for instance: hollow pain, blue color; sore pain, red color; deep headache, vivid scarlet; superficial headache, white color."

Dr. Coriat's discoveries will doubtless prove, if the term may be permitted, "epoch-making." The use of a

word like "loud" to describe flamboyant attire, "dark-brown" to express an unpleasant taste, and "blue" to indicate lowness of spirits, has hitherto been thought highly figurative language that refined lovers of "understatement" always avoid. But now the use of such terms can be defended on scientific grounds, and there will develop a race of expert "chromesthesiaists" who will be able to express with the colors of the spectrum every sound the human ear can catch, every taste the palate can enjoy, and every emotion that stirs the heart. A trumpet-blast, for example, will doubtless be a vivid red, a chanted dirge a deep violet, a pleasant "Good Morning" a delicate green. The taste of onions, too, might well be described with a sort of Niobitic yellow; that of terrapin with brilliant blue; and Boston beans with a not-too-sober gray. The anxiety insistent creditors cause a merchant would probably be a mauve tint which could readily be distinguished from the lilac hue with which a greedy boy's repentance is feelingly expressed. But no one but a highly-skilled chromesthesiaist could tell just how the sigh of a love-lorn swain differed in color from that of a briefless barrister, or discern the scarlet elation of a successful office-seeker from the cherry-colored blitheness of a rising author. The science of chromesthesia has, unquestionably, a bright future.

Open Advocacy of Sin

THE gradual but steady reversion of our civilization to the ideals and practices of paganism is making it increasingly difficult for Catholics to maintain a firm hold on Christian principles. Christ's code of morals, though not by that name, is being branded as superstition. Advocates of the new ethics are waxing stronger and bolder, and doctrines which a score of years ago were whispered in secret, are now shouted from the housetops. Practices which are clearly in violation of one of the most obvious mandates of the natural law, and which, moreover, have been forbidden by unmistakable and direct revelations of the divine will, are now unblushingly advised as the dictates of the "clean good sense of mankind." The prohibition of the detestable deeds, similar in effect at least to Onan's, is lightly called a "hideous doctrine." We quote from the *New Republic*, in the issue of March 6:

The time is at hand when men and women must denounce it as a conspiracy against the race, when public opinion must compel the amendment of laws which make it a criminal offence to teach people how to control their fertility. Harmless methods of preventing conception are known. . . . But what so many of the well-to-do and the educated practice, the poor are prevented from learning. . . . They pay for it . . . by the production of a horde of unwanted souls. . . . There is not one of these miseries which can not be largely reduced by the extension to all classes of inventions already the property of the educated. What are the objections to the use of a knowledge which is defended by so few and practised by so many? The root of them is the tendency to

shudder at anything which seems to interfere with God's plan. . . . But the clean, good sense of mankind is through with that black inversion.

All this is abominable. It is teaching and pleading the cause of mortal sin. And its danger is the greater by reason of its insidious plea for the happiness of mankind. Such writers, knowing no better, are seemingly sincere. Taking their stand on the purely natural, and starting from the principle that the diminution of temporal infelicity is the greatest good, they look on the rights of man as supreme, disregard entirely the rights of God, and leave altogether out of account the supernatural. It is to be regretted that any paper should make itself the spokesman of a reactionary and immoral doctrine that is a menace both to the individual and society. The Catholic attitude is expressed in the words of an indignant subscriber, published in a subsequent number of the *New Republic*, who declares the article in question to be "deserving of rebuke beyond the power of words to express. The doctrine there taught is not only flagrant immorality, but criminal, and there should be laws enacted to punish as criminals the sowing of such tares. The article evinces hopeless immorality. . . . I can not have a paper that would publish such filth come into my house. Please remove my name from your list." With this criticism all Catholics will be in sympathy. Such writing pollutes the atmosphere of the home.

The Hope of the World

A MIGHTY prayer for peace has been lifted up to the Sacred Heart by the nations far removed from the war-stricken countries of Europe. Once more divine charity has overflowed upon the earth from the fountain of love, that "love alone might reign among men." What response the charity of God will find in the hearts of His creatures we can not tell. What still remains to be drained of that cup of bitterness which the folly of irreligion has held to the lips of mankind we can not know. Of one thing alone we are certain, that our prayers are not without result, no matter when it may be that in God's providence the din of battle will cease and the last wreath of smoke rise from the cannon's mouth and melt away into the sky of peace. Blessed, at all events, are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy.

Fittingly it was to the Sacred Heart that we cried out in the world's great need. It was the bloody implement of war, the world-conquering spear of the Roman legionary, which opened wide the Heart of Christ, that thence might flow the last drops of the Precious Blood. Christ had tasted for us dereliction and torment and agonies far greater than all the pains war could inflict upon the world's sufferers. He had triumphed in the midst of defeat and through death had achieved victory, that the conquered even more than the conquerors might look up to Him and gain strength as well as comfort, finding even in failure the source of supreme success.

To Him, therefore, we have turned, following the example set us by the Sovereign Pontiff. Who, indeed, was not moved at the thought of that white-robed, spiritual figure of the Vicar of Christ, casting himself in lowliness before the altar and calling in a voice filled with emotion upon the Heart of the Saviour to have pity and mercy, to inspire rulers and peoples with counsels of meekness and bring back love and peace to the discordant earth? Surely, the world is better for that prayer, and for the countless petitions that have since arisen to Heaven with it. How God in return may dispense His blessings we leave to His own infinite mercy and wisdom to decide. Whether the longed-for peace come soon or late, it suffices for us to trust in His love and know that our prayers can never be in vain. We still, therefore, shall continue to implore that war may cease, that enmities may be laid aside and, above all, that His holy will be done, in whose love alone the world can find its lasting peace.

Saints Made While You Wait

WE sometimes hear, "She is a saint," and, alas, more rarely, "He is a saint." The regular process of making a saint is a long and expensive one. The chief requisite is that you must be dead fifty years. Other difficult requisites are a host of witnesses to bear testimony to your heroic virtues and an officer, in whose duties we are all expert from daily practice, but who makes it hard for candidates of sanctity to escape his rake and finer-toothed comb and dissecting blade and high-power microscope. This dexterous official with the surgeon's case is the *advocatus diaboli*, styled in the President's English, the devil's advocate. Now in olden days the people made saints, as they made bishops and popes, by acclamation, or if they did not make them, they nominated them, and left it to the proper authority to ratify their choice. People every day block the canonization of so many saints that it is too bad the opposite process is not encouraged more.

"Let the people make saints," is a good campaign cry to go to the country with. "Canonized in America" should be a popular trademark. Of course there will be certain necessary qualifications, but we must not be too exacting. The people's standard of sanctity is high already. Men and women do not rush into conversation with the cry, "That's a saint!" But if any one declares, "She never says a word against a single person." "That will do," is the unanimous cry, "Canonize her." Next! "He never yet looked around before speaking to see whether any ladies were present." "Canonized!" say all. The people judge the health of the soul and its sanctity, as doctors judge the health of the body, by looking at the tongue, and in the case of the soul the test works better.

Keeping it up is another school for saints. We propose some candidates whose perseverance merits perhaps the degree. Here is a weak woman, looks fifty but is not

near it, has been nursing a sick father who is helpless as a child but not as easily helped; works every day in a factory, is alone, except when bothered by a worse than helpless brother. What do you think? Had we not better call her, say, Saint Alpha Aquilae: that is, a star of the first magnitude. Here is candidate number two, already canonized by his mother who gives the testimony. Deponent states that her son is now over thirty, he does not drink; smokes occasionally but not to hurt any one; has never been known to swear, has to work on Sunday and can not, unhappily, go often to Mass; has given to herself, the mother, his pay-envelope, every week of his life, with his whole pay—Enough! Let him in at once and call him Saint Multiplicand, and let the nuns have a new name so that they wont have to be going back to Egypt for titles, calling themselves, Sister Psammithicus or the like. Here is the last candidate offered to-day: She is the mother of ten children. Hold! Her process of canonization is over; chant the *Iste Confessor*. What's that? The devil's advocate objects: "She was not present at the Euchre and Dance for Nativity Parish." "Why, Mr. Advocate, she made the parish." Objection is at once withdrawn.

This is a test of a true saint. He never knows he is one although the whole world unites in considering him a saint. Tell any of the above that they are doing something extraordinary, and they will not believe it. They are doing nothing at all, they feel, and will continue to do nothing at all until St. Peter closes and locks the gates of heaven behind them. Then, looking around, they will inquire in amazement, "When did we do anything to deserve this?"

It may be objected that this new process of canonization acts too swiftly. We do not think so. Saints may be made in a second. One great sinner had seven devils exorcised with one word, "because she loved much"; another sinner was dismissed forgiven, to sin no more, "because no one condemned her"; another was sanctified by a look; another, a robber and a murderer, was canonized as he was put to death for his crimes. No, the process is not too swift. Volunteers are wanted. As you go through the parish hereafter, canonize a saint at every house. There will be devil's advocates enough, don't you fear, to delay the process.

LITERATURE

Twenty "Don'ts" of Science

IT is a remarkable fact that until comparatively recent years there has been a general impression that no development of science worth mentioning took place before our time, and that the biological sciences, and particularly such applied scientific departments as medicine and surgery, had utterly failed to develop. Indeed, many men, who thought themselves well-read and who were reputed well-educated, argued that since there had been no development of science before our age, there must be some strong reason for it, so they fixed upon the Church as the scapegoat. For she, it was assumed, was the power which prevented, or at least dis-

couraged, all really scientific investigations. Here in America Professor Draper and President White, with this for a thesis, wrote books that are widely known and still widely read.

But we have changed all that. We know that the medieval universities, far from suppressing science in any way, were actually scientific universities. Above all, the medical schools of these old-time universities developed magnificently, and their text-books, which have recently been republished, are very valuable contributions to medical and surgical science. Though most of these works were first printed in the time of the Renaissance, they had been gathering dust on the shelves of libraries until a generation ago.

As a consequence of renewed acquaintance with these books all our ideas about the state of medicine and surgery, and regarding the development of the biological sciences in the Middle Ages, have been revolutionized. We know that often during the past eight centuries men have made remarkable advances in medicine and surgery, anticipating some of the great "discoveries" only recently made. At the last meeting of the International Medical Congress a special section on the history of medicine was organized, because it was felt that that department not only presented details of interest to antiquarians, but because it enabled the present generation to face more critically many problems concerning the nature and treatment of disease, for much of the experience gained in preceding centuries had unfortunately been lost.

It is easy, therefore, to understand how many wrong impressions with regard to the history of science are now current. Instead of that almost universal neglect of scientific research, which had been supposed, there was, on the contrary, lively interest in such questions and those who write loosely about the history of science are sure to make even greater mistakes here than in general history. As the newer development of the history of science is even less generally known than the recent developments in political and educational history, editors, writers and lecturers frequently fall into ridiculous errors because their knowledge is not "up-to-date." So these "Twenty 'Don'ts' of Science" are gathered together with the object of preventing "educated" people from dropping into absurdities with regard to the history of science:

Don't refer lightly and confidently to a papal bull which forbade the study of anatomy by dissection. The document referred to is easily obtained, and you will find that instead of the supposed prohibition of anatomy it is a wise hygienic regulation. (See "The Popes and Science.")

Don't cite, though many have done so, a papal bull forbidding chemistry, for when you read the text of that document it proves to be a statute prohibiting counterfeiting.

Don't quote the famous bull against Halley's comet. That bull has never been found. Within five years of the time when it is supposed to have been issued, Regiomontanus, often called the father of modern astronomy, was invited to Rome to become papal astronomer.

Don't listen to that nonsense about ecclesiastical opposition to surgery. One of the most wonderful surgeons of history is Theodoric of Lucca, who was a bishop; the father of modern French surgery, Guy de Chauliac, was a clergyman.

Don't hint that in order to make money by pilgrimages, relics, shrines and prayers, the Church discouraged the development of medicine and surgery. The greatest list of scientific doctors in the history of medicine is that of the papal physicians.

Don't fail to recall that Copernicus, the great founder of the Copernican theory, was a canon, owed his post-graduate education to the cathedral chapter, spent ten years in Italy and was eternally grateful to his Italian masters.

Don't forget that pious scientists have existed. Linacre, the Englishman to whom medicine and scholarship owe so much, became a priest toward the end of his life.

Don't forget that the pious Galvani was buried at his own request in the habit of St. Francis, Ampère's favorite devotion was his beads, Pasteur was a devout communicant, Volta scoffed at the notion of having any doubts about faith.

Don't boast of our development of dentistry: the filling of teeth with gold and other metals, the capping of teeth, various methods of dental prosthesis and even transplantation of teeth are all old inventions.

Don't talk about sanitation as new. The medieval people made regulations that enabled them to get rid of leprosy when it was nearly as common as tuberculosis is now, and we shall do very well if we succeed in obliterating our folk disease as successfully as they did.

Don't forget to look up the pure food and drug laws of medieval Italy before boasting about our enlightenment in this matter. In those days the purveyor of impure drugs was hanged. A cheating druggist's stock was confiscated.

Don't boast of the perfection of our medical education until you read the laws of the Middle Ages. Before a young physician was allowed to set up for himself three years of preliminary work at the university were required and then four years at the study of medicine, besides an extra year's practice under a doctor or surgeon.

Don't quote the Galileo case to prove that the Church has hampered science as a policy. Cardinal Newman, whose logic is unquestioned and unquestionable, has suggested that if this is the only case that can be cited in 700 years, then it must be considered the exception which proves the rule. And Augustus de Morgan agreed with Newman.

Don't quote Galileo's *È pur se muove*: "And yet it moves." That expression was not heard of for considerably more than a century after Galileo's day, and is then found for the first time in the *seventh edition* of a French biographical dictionary, though it had not occurred in the Galileo article of the sixth edition.

Don't talk about Galileo's dungeon, nor his years of imprisonment. He never was in prison for an hour. He was sentenced to remain in the custody of a friend, and after a year his son was made his custodian. The principal part of his punishment—Poor man!—was the recital of the Seven Penitential Psalms every day for three years.

Don't think that science is explaining mysteries. Science multiplies mysteries and the more we know the more we know that we do not know. Professor Ramsay, the great English physicist, says that as a young man he started out with the idea that he would never accept anything that he did not understand, but he found that it was almost impossible to meet with anything that he could fully understand.

Don't write about a knowledge of science as making more difficult a belief in a personal God. Lord Kelvin, the greatest of modern physicists, declared that science *demonstrates* the existence of a Creator.

Don't suggest that when a man knows a great deal about scientific medicine he loses his faith. Morgagni, Malpighi, Laennec, Johann Müller, the father of modern German medicine; Theodor Schwann, the father of the cell doctrine; Claude Bernard, the greatest of modern physiologists, and above all Louis Pasteur, the greatest contributor to modern medicine, were actually practical Catholics.

Don't forget the remark Dean Stanley made as he lay on a sick bed from which it was thought he would never rise: "Life looks very different when viewed from the horizontal." Life and its philosophy look very different when viewed from the gathering shadows of the end of life.

Don't forget Francis Bacon's well-known expression "A

little philosophy"—by which he meant natural philosophy, or as we call it, science—"inclineth man's mind, to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion."

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., PH.D.

REVIEWS

The Society of the Sacred Heart. By JANET ERSKINE STUART. Roehampton, London: The Convent of the Sacred Heart.

The late Mother Stuart had the rare gift of saying much, and saying it well, in a very few words. Hers was not, it has been remarked, an intellect of an unusually high order. But for all practical purposes it was something better. It was a trained intellect, sharp and clear, with a way, almost disconcerting at times, of going straight to the heart of things. One might expect the present little volume to treat exclusively of the world-wide Society which Mother Stuart guarded so faithfully and with much success, during a very troublous period. In a sense this expectation is not disappointed. But Mother Stuart, in setting forth the peculiar genius of her Society, has given an explanation of the fundamental principles of the religious life, which is a marvel of clear and concise exposition. An over-worked phrase helps many a lame critic over a stile, especially if the phrase happens to express a literal truth. By leave of the purist, then, it may be said that Mother Stuart's book has an appeal that is extraordinarily wide.

First, to her own daughters in religion, to whom the book is her legacy. These will gladly reread the exhortations to religious perfection penned by a Mother who always added to her teaching the force of her own example. Then, to the thousands of women whose good fortune it was to be brought under the strong, yet gentle, influence of these faithful, self-denying daughters of the Sacred Heart. As a book of spiritual reading, especially for young religious, it would be most useful. In these simple pages, the Catholic laity will find that information on the spirit of the consecrated life, with which, sad to relate, many well-educated Catholics are strangely and shockingly unfamiliar. To the educated non-Catholic, in search of similar information on this folly of the Cross, no better book could be given. He will here find his difficulties answered, not polemically, but by a calm statement of the Gospel principles on which the religious life is founded and, by a convincing account utterly free from exaggeration, of the manner in which these principles are made to count in daily life.

This little book, the voice of one who being dead, yet speaketh, is certain to work an immense amount of good. Mother Stuart's "The Education of Catholic Girls" is, in the reviewer's opinion, easily the best book on the subject in the English language. The volumes of Mother Stuart's writings already accessible to the public, make one look forward with eagerness to her "Instructions for Religious Communities," which, it is reported, are now being prepared for publication.

P. L. B.

The Scotch-Irish in America. By HENRY JONES FORD. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press. \$2.00.

At this time, when hyphenated Americans are under a ban, it would seem inopportune to add a mythical combination to the real varieties; but "Scotch-Irish" and "Anglo-Saxons" are privileged. It were almost as easy to construct a bulky volume on Irish snakes as on the "Scotch-Irish" race; yet Professor Ford of Princeton has managed to achieve 611 pages on the thesis that at the time of the Ulster plantation Scotland was peopled by Saxons, Teutons, Scandinavians, Flemish, Picts—anything but Celts, who had been largely exterminated; that the planters made up of this Teutonic mixture and a larger number of English Teutons, having ousted the barbarous Irish of Ulster, became "Scotch-Irish," sudden and

unawares; that the descendants of these formed almost exclusively the immigrants that came from Ireland to America up to the nineteenth century, and that they and all others of Irish origin who distinguished themselves here were always "Scotch-Irish," even when they styled themselves otherwise. The professor is chary of references, seldom tells from what Irish ports the numerous Irish immigrants sailed to the colonies, and never spreads out their names from State and city records, so that the reader may pass judgment on genealogies; and though they themselves, in every passage cited descriptive of their origin, write themselves down as plain Irish, and not one is found in which they claim to be "Scotch-Irish," yet the author chooses invariably so to designate them, and on page after page multiplies the hyphenated miscegenation till the thesis is proved by iteration.

Ethnologically and historically Irish-Irish would be a better designation. Ireland, which was called Scotia up to the twelfth century, colonized western Caledonia in its pre-Christian days, and thereafter Christianized and civilized the whole country, giving it a king, dynasty, literature, name, and national life. The Princetonian claim that the later prevalence of Saxon dialect in the Lowlands, where Gaelic names still predominate, proves the English origin of its people, would also prove that all others of English speech, even our Afro-Americans, are Anglo-Saxon. The English-speaking Scots, having degenerated from Gaelic Christianity into Calvinistic iconoclasts and joy-killers, King James transplanted them to "extirp" their Gaelic cousins of Ulster. The professor's account of the whole abominable procedure follows the most bigoted English versions, now thoroughly discredited, and he grounds his hearty approval on the necessity of civilizing the barbarous Irish. Douglas Hyde's contrast between the lofty tone and exquisite art of the Irish poets of the period and the vulgar and murderous Calvinistic psalm-singers is evidently unknown at Princeton. However, contact with the undegenerate Gaels improved them, and later kings, having filched them also of religious and economic rights and privileges, the Ulster Presbyterians, fraternizing with the Catholics in common resistance to oppression, and losing much of their Calvinistic dourness, soon became Irish; and, fleeing to America with burning hate of their oppressors, both entered with zest into the Revolution, contributed most to its success, and made possible the religious liberty clauses in our Constitution.

They were just plain Irish, whatever their remote origin, and, whether Protestant or Catholic, Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. In Boston, New York, Philadelphia, St. Patrick was their patron. The medal of the Philadelphia Friendly Sons, and which they presented to Washington on his adoption, showed St. Patrick crushing a snake, and Liberty resting on a harp as she joined Hibernia and America—surely no "Scotch-Irish" device. These were mainly Protestants, but the predominance of Irish Catholics in colonial immigration is clearly proved in T. H. Maginniss' thoroughly documented work "The Irish Contribution to American Independence." (Cf. AMERICA, Vol. IX, 16, 17.) "Scotch-Irish" means Protestant Irish, if anything. It is an afterthought to filch the Catholic Gael of American distinction. Mr. Ford has not filched it of ethnic absurdity.

M. K.

An Introduction to the Mystical Life. By the ABBÉ P. LEJEUNE. Translated from the French by BASIL LEVETT. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$1.25.

Practical Mysticism. By EVELYN UNDERHILL. New York: Dutton & Co. \$1.00.

The former of these volumes is appropriately named. An introduction to the mystical life it is in the fullest sense, and as such it is a pleasure to recommend it most cordially. Not because it contains anything novel, but precisely because it is so

clear and so faithful a digest of the teaching of acknowledged masters in the field of mystical theology, will the work be of the greatest service to directors, and to all who aspire to the higher life. Whenever an authority is cited, the writer takes pains to give the exact reference; this begets confidence, and may be taken as an index of the scholarly thoroughness apparent throughout the volume. In the preface, it is stated emphatically that the mystical life is not with any infallible certainty the outcome of our own effort, however rightly that effort may have been made; it is God's free gift to whom He pleases and when He pleases. Our part consists in cultivating the soil to render it fit to receive the heavenly showers. The first chapter contains a brief but masterly exposition of what is understood by the mystical life; in the following five chapters, the author points out some of the practices which form the best dispositions for the same, while the book closes with a searching analysis of the transition of the generous soul from the ordinary spiritual life, through the prayer of simple advertence and, through what St. John of the Cross has so fittingly called "the night of the senses," into the mystic city. The writer is avowedly an enemy to vagueness of thought and expression; his language throughout is clear, succinct, kindly and alike free from technicalities and idle speculations. The translator has done his work well.

In "Practical Mysticism" the reviewer has to do with a book of a very different stamp. Most of the qualities which he has praised in the former volume, are here sadly wanting. Miss Underhill (Mrs. Stuart Moore) intends her work for normal minds, yet the average reader, even if he has had sufficient grit to wade through it, will carry away from the volume very little enlightenment. As the book goes on, the impression grows that the writer is often employing words, not to disclose but to enshroud her thought. Whether or not she believes in a personal God is not at all clear, and she shows no acquaintance with the supernatural. If Miss Underhill is not a Monist, her words not unfrequently leave themselves open to grave misinterpretation, for, consciously or otherwise, she borrows freely from the language of pantheism. The volume is verbose, nebulous, evasive, as well as doctrinally objectionable, and, after a dreary ramble, the reviewer laid it aside, without learning either what mysticism is or the author's mind on the subject.

D. J. C.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Those who have read Dr. James J. Walsh's "Sixty Historical 'Don'ts'" in the *Catholic Mind* for February 22 will find equally interesting his "Fifty 'Don'ts' of Science," which appear in the current number of that periodical. Some of these "Don'ts" will be found in this number of AMERICA. The March 22 *Mind* also contains Mr. Nelson Hume's excellent paper on "Catholics in the Y. M. C. A." and it is followed by several shorter articles which show the true character of that organization. The number concludes with a summary of our new Catholic statistics.

Here is some recent music: For the service of the Three Hours on Good Friday, J. Fischer & Bro. have published in octavo "The Seven Last Words" (\$0.25), with verses and music by the Rev. John G. Hacker, S.J. These hymn tunes—one for each of the seven words of Our Lord on the cross—are written for solo or unison chorus with organ accompaniment. They are called "simple" in a prefatory note by the composer, but they are not of the kind that will immediately find favor with a congregational choir, nor are their accompaniments, which are harmonized in the modern manner, likely to lessen the apparent austerity of the tunes. There is, however, a subdued attractiveness to these hymns which repetition, no doubt, will serve to disclose. Because of the evident care and earnest workmanship manifested in their composition, these hymns

deserve to be commended to all choirs called upon to provide unison music for the service of the Three Hours. Under the title "Laudes Vespertinae sive Thesaurus Cantionum" (\$0.35), Fr. Pustet & Co. have collected together in a handy volume a number of Gregorian hymns and selections from the proper of the Mass, the Vesper service and from Compline. For church choirs and communities that use Gregorian to any extent this volume ought to prove a convenience. For the use of choirs, Rev. Edw. J. Murphy has compiled "Latin Pronounced for Choirs" (H. L. Kilner, Philadelphia, \$0.25), a small manual of the more usual Latin hymns, wherein each syllable is phonetically spelled out according to the Roman-Italian method of pronunciation. A companion volume, "Latin Pronounced for Altar Boys" (\$0.25), spells out in the same way the prayers at Mass. Luckhardt & Belder have published a song entitled "Irish Names," words by John Ludlow, music by Mamie Graham Destamps, in which much is said and sung of the "Names wid a body an' bones an' a soul to thim." All concerned should examine this song to see if their names are properly recorded in the chorus.

Priests who are eager to increase their usefulness as confessors will be glad to know of a pamphlet entitled "Examen Conscientiae seu Methodus Excipiendi Confessiones Variis in Linguis" (Pustet, \$0.20) which Father Fulgentius M. Krebs, O.M.C., has prepared. In German, French, English, Italian, Spanish and Polish are arranged in parallel tables well-worded questions the priest needs to ask penitents, and the ritual and prayers for the administration of the last sacraments are added.—Somewhat similar in its scope is "Religious Terms: One Hundred and One Signs" (The Xavier Ephpheta Society, 30 W. 16th St., New York, \$0.10), a little book the Rev. M. R. McCarthy, S.J., has published. The ideographic signs used by our Catholic deaf mutes when they converse about religious practices are very interesting and expressive. Confession, for instance, is indicated by crossing the fingers of both hands, "forming a screen, held at the ear"; justice: "the thumb and forefinger of each hand forming a circumference and teetering, indicating a balance"; obstinacy: "the back of the open hands held up at either temple, indicating a donkey"; Church: "'C' resting on the back of the left hand as if on a rock." The manual alphabet is also given.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Benziger Bros., New York:

A Manual of Church History. By Francis Xavier Funk. Translated by P. Perciballi and edited by W. H. Kent, O.S.C. 2 Vols. \$5.50.

Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis:

The Wayward Child. By Hannah Kent Schoff. \$1.00.

George H. Doran Co., New York:

Arundel. By E. F. Benson. \$1.25.

Doubleday Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y.:

Dr. Syn. By Russell Thorne. \$1.25.

E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:

Who Built the Panama Canal? By W. Leon Pepperman. \$2.00; The Wild Knight. By G. K. Chesterton. \$1.25.

B. Herder, St. Louis:

Sweet-Scented Leaves. By Mrs. Armel O'Connor. \$1.25; Poems. By Armel O'Connor. \$0.75; Les Cloches des Morts. By the Author of "By the Grey Sea." \$0.45; The Mirror. By Mary F. Nixon-Roulet. \$0.60; The Earthly Paradise or The Vocation to the Religious State. By Rev. John Henry, C.S.S.R. \$0.15; Vida Popular de San Vincente de Paul. \$0.50; La Tolerancia. Por A. Vermeersch, S.J. \$1.45; Manuale Theologiae Moralis. Edidit Dominicus M. Prümmer. O. Pr. III. Tom. \$7.50.

P. J. Kennedy & Sons, New York:

Loneliness? By Robert Hugh Benson. \$1.35.

John Lane Co., New York:

A Pilgrim's Scrip. By R. Campbell Thompson. \$3.50.

The Macmillan Co., New York:

The Episcopal Church. By George Hodges. \$1.25.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:

The Origins of the War. By J. Holland Rose. \$1.00; The World Crisis and the Way to Peace. By E. Elisworth Shumaker. \$0.75.

Sturgis & Walton Co., New York:

Socialism as the Sociological Ideal. By Floyd J. Melvin. \$1.25.

EDUCATION

Content of the Youthful Mind

CONTENT! That's the word. If you are a teacher, you have heard it. The dictionary admits a doubt as to the accent, but no intellectual has any hesitancy on that point. Lay the stress on the first syllable. Lay it strong. Content! The dictionary says that the word is ordinarily used in the plural, but an intellectual is nothing ordinary. If you want to be an intellectual, use the word in the singular. Say content. Do not say contents.

CRASS PERSONS

The content of the youthful mind! Dear teacher, seated at the feet of wisdom in educational meeting and convention, you have heard that expression. You have *felt* it dropped on your head. Its weight was leaden because it was spoken with the complete conviction of a scientific conclusion. Do you doubt the content of the youthful mind? What ignorance! What pedagogical incapacity! Experts in pedagogy are sure of the content. Some of them have not had much, or perhaps any, acquaintance with youthful minds; they have not had the chance to hear the hollow rattle of the empty sconce as you have had who are a teacher, but by reason of this lack of actual experience, they are all the surer of the content. The psychology of pedagogy vouches for it! Can you doubt it after that? Yes, even after that there are some teachers who doubt it. Not so long ago a teacher of English in a State Normal School dared to say that even in the minds of a good many normal pupils there was no content. And this in the face of the psychology of pedagogy! How unspeakably crass!

DRY WELLS

Yes, it is crass. It is as crass as solid, unyielding fact. To hear some educational pedants talk of the content of the youthful mind, one might easily conclude that they believed either that the mind is filled with innate knowledge or that it can evolve thought out of nothing. A great deal of fun has been poked at Macaulay's schoolboy, but it is generally understood that he worked hard in order to gain his large and varied store of information. His inventor is not supposed to have claimed that his infant phenomenon was born with a mind that was a living well, and that all the child had to do was to dip in and draw forth knowledge; in fact, that the mind was an artesian well, and that the knowledge simply ran over. Macaulay knew what literary composition meant, and if he thought of the youthful mind as a well at all, it was as of a well which was empty by nature and which had to be filled by hard labor at the pumps. What a practical teacher rejects is the arrogant assumption of pedagogical theorists that English composition is a process of drawing thought out of minds into which no thought has ever been put.

These teachers know as well as pedagogical experts that literature is personal thought. They recognize that it is the original idea which is the test of the literary artist, but has the average pupil *any* ideas, let alone original ones?

SEEING NOTHING

In his autobiography Sir William Butler says: "Had it been possible for any one child to tell us exactly what he saw when he first opened his eyes, that earliest impression of the world would probably have proved the most interesting brain-picture ever given by an individual to the general public." But Sir William Butler was never a teacher. Had he been, he would not have written thus. The teacher of an

average primary or secondary class would say that the child so opening his eyes probably saw nothing. All of us, no doubt, on one or other occasion, have sat looking at an object, perhaps staring at it for a length of time, and seen nothing. We call it abstraction. We do not give young people credit for it, but teachers know that young people, at least many of them, are gifted with extraordinary powers of abstraction. We read in the lives of some of the youthful saints that they knew the ways only to church and to school. In this virtue the average schoolboy outstrips the saints. He does not know even those ways. Ask him what he sees daily on his way to and from school, and you will find that he sees next to nothing. Ask him with what he keeps his mind busy while making the trip and he will come very near the truth when he answers: "Nothing."

This is rather discouraging when you are looking for the content of the youthful mind. It is more than discouraging if you are blamed for not discovering the said content. It is certain that boys and girls of school age have countless experiences, but they do not seem to experience them. All knowledge comes through the senses. Young people seem to be hearing, seeing, sensing all day long, but an investigation leads one to think that it is only seeming. "Merely this and nothing more." The senses appear to reflect rather than to refract impressions. We express the phenomenon by saying that young people do not observe. The youthful mind is capable of containing much, but in reality it contains very little. Considering its varied experience, it ought to have a content but, as a matter of fact, it usually has not and it never will have until it is taught to observe.

CREATIVE POWER

But what of creative power? If you deny the content of the youthful mind, do you not throw out of the count all that has ever been urged for originality. Can there be any literary work without creation? No, but what does literary creation mean?

Edmund Burke may be said, in the literary sense, to have created India. He never lived there and still knew it better than many who had. That was creative imagination. What did it mean? It meant the ability to reconstruct in imagination the peoples and places of which he had read, to bring together in one picture the facts and faces he had seen in many. What would Tennyson, Milton or Shakespere be without creative imagination? They surely possessed more of the gift than we can expect to find in any pupil or class of pupils we may hope to meet, but even in them what does the power mean? It means at the most that they were able to take different threads of thought and weave them into one picture. It means exactly what the word *composition* signifies. It is a true philosophy and one as old as Aristotle that there is nothing in the mind which has not been derived through the senses. This does not mean that the mind can not divide and combine what it thus receives into shapes and forms so new and original that men will not be able to recognize the source, but it does mean that the mind does not, in the strict sense of the word, create. It does not bring into being something which did not exist, either in itself or in any principle. The combination of thought wrought by the mind is as new as a statue fresh-hewn from the stone, but every element in the composition is old. To originate the very elements of thought would be to create in the strictest sense of the scholastic term, and that is a power belonging to God alone.

THE RADICAL ERROR

If brought face to face with it, the pedagogical experts who prate of content would in all probability disavow any

concept of literary creation so extreme as this. Still one can not listen to them long without coming to the conclusion that, if they have any theory of thought, it must be either a doctrine such as this or a system of innate ideas. One is as impossible as the other, and neither squares with experience.

Content, or contents, every mind must have before it attempts composition. But every teacher with any experience knows that, while there are exceptions, the average class of primary, secondary or even college students must be *made* to impress before they can be expected to express anything. It is the seemingly complete disregard for this process of impression which stirs the bile of teacher against these exploiters of the content. Those who have had experience in the classroom know that even when they have painstakingly led the mind to think, it is another struggle to teach it to set forth what it contains. To dilate on this difficulty is not the purpose of this paper. It is enough for the present, to insist in the name of teachers suffering from the scourge of certain *scientific experts* in pedagogy, that the mind, at least if it be a normal and not an abnormal mind, must gather thought before it can express it.

Campion College, Wisconsin. JOHN P. McNICHOLLS, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

Doing God's Work

IT is an old, old story, but ever new, like a classic. It thrilled us years ago, when generous and unsophisticated hearts beat in these bosoms. Perhaps it would thrill us again, were we thrown into its atmosphere of muted violins to gaze upon the dimmed lights, star-pointed in wet eyes. It is the ancient story of persecuted virtue, set forth in the melodrama entitled, "Nellie, the Beautiful Cloak Model."

THE TIRELESS VILLAIN

Nellie was surely an indestructible heroine. In the early part of the action, as you remember, the villain pushed her off the Brooklyn Bridge. Was he foiled? He was, for Nellie either swam ashore, or was picked up by a battleship from the neighboring navy yard. Memory dims these early pictures, and details merge, as in a Corot. At their next meeting, our heroine was cast overboard from an Atlantic liner. But virtue again triumphed, and Nellie lived to be thrust under a descending elevator by this singularly resourceful villain. Once more his plans went astray, and in despair, the villain cried in his most rumbling and heart-thrilling tones, "Nellie, why do you fear me?"

The moral of this pretty tale is not precisely obvious. It seems a trifle irreverent to compare our beautiful Catholic charities with the hapless Nellie, but the villain is surely a blood-brother, or at least a cousin, to the promoters of commercialized philanthropy, and the Charity Trusts, now springing up in many American cities. But it should also be added that Catholics are not in the least afraid of the villain.

ANTI-SOCIAL BROTHERS

"We are not working against the sectarian institutions," is the cry of this gentry. To a certain extent, this statement is true. Their plans are far deeper. Sincerest friendship, they say, can not disguise the fact that Catholic institutions, while they may have rendered some limited social service in a ruder age, stand in sore need of certain immediate reforms. To begin with, Brothers and Sisters, brought up in convents, are notoriously lacking in the social view. Although they and their spiritual ancestors have been training children with notable success for a good many centuries, this tradition contains little of value, when measured with the

knowledge which a wide-eyed damsel can pick up in two or three years at a School of Philanthropy. Teach your grandmother to suck eggs? Why, certainly. Grandmother died a good many years ago, and it was only in the second decade of the twentieth century that the Government issued its monograph on the distinction between good eggs and bad. Priests and nuns, it is whispered, actually put piety above plumbing in the scale of importance. They actually teach the children things about sin when, as is well known, what was once called sin is nothing but a temporary blurring of one's orientation, for which the individual is responsible, if at all, only in a minor degree. Worse, they lead the children to believe that this sin is forgiven by some mystic process in which God, prayer and the Sacraments are involved. This is highly unscientific, and may readily become anti-social. So-called "naughty" children should consult not a priest but a physician. Very probably they are afflicted with adenoids or need glasses. If this diagnosis fails, search the family-tree. There is little doubt that a ticket-of-leave grandfather will be found hiding among the branches.

CHARITY ON A PAYING BASIS

It is obvious, then, to the meanest intellect, that these Brothers and Sisters are unfit guardians of our wayward or unfortunate children. Catholic institutions can never amount to much, until these strabismic individuals are sent packing. Let them be replaced by graduates of some school of philanthropy, carefully trained in "the larger, wider, clearer vision of social service," which teaches that, on the whole, the less we have of God and anti-social religious observances, such as Christian marriage, kosher and the Friday abstinence, the better. As general supervisors and efficiency experts, let us call in the social directors and the commercialized philanthropists, offering, to be sure, a generous salary, for, as we have been told even to satiety, "a low grade salary attracts only a low grade man." When these few trifling reforms have been made, and the Brothers and Sisters imurred in monasteries to do penance for their social sinfulness, Catholics may feel at liberty to dot the land with houses of relief and correction, with never a peep of protest from the "large-minded" persons, whose present aim looks suspiciously like an attempt to put Christian charity on a commercial basis.

CRUEL, ONLY TO BE KIND

This is what the incorporators of Charity Trusts really mean when they aver that they love us, but, frankly, that we must not expect them to be blind to our obvious faults. "It was all very well to dissemble your love," runs the ancient lilt, "But why did you kick me down stairs?" The Charity Trusts approve of us highly in the Sunday papers, but they feel it a duty to point out that our concept of charity and reform is radically wrong. They are cruel, they protest, only to be kind. Very possibly the villain, to return to our limping parable, which every moment seems more unfit, had some idea of correcting a temperamental perversity when he pushed Nellie off the Brooklyn Bridge. Death, it is true, straightens out temperamental kinks very effectively, but it is not a very good cure because it also removes the subject in whom they existed.

Our Catholic charities would be neither charitable nor Catholic, did they adopt the program proposed by modern philanthropy. For that philanthropy eliminates God by declaring Him of secondary importance. It is true, fortunately, that some of its professors are better than their principles. It is also true, that some of its followers can write so touchingly of "religion as a social force," that one might think himself listening to a newly-discovered sermon of St. Vincent

de Paul, until from the cloud of words the clear fact emerges that, in the view of these sociologists, religion means little more than sentimentality, or an absolutely false and unreal estheticism. A lady, with leanings to sociological research, has recently declared that a woman now in prison, a woman whose education and position did not keep her from murdering her two babies, could never have had this impulse, when suddenly she was called upon to pay the price of sin, could she have been taken habitually into some cool twilight grot, there to listen to a Beethoven symphony.

HOW MUCH ARE YOU WORTH?

Religion put on a par with a love of old porcelain, or a delicate ear for music, is not religion at all. One wonders what would have happened to Pippa, singing not in a poem, but in Italy. Frequently a nasty mixture is the result of diluting religion with alleged estheticism. Eliminate the concept of another world from your schemes of sociological reconstruction, and you are considering not the whole of the problem, nor even the half. But in view of our participation in immortality, it is not inadequate, but fundamentally false. For we have not here an abiding resting-place, but seek that which is everlasting, even the humblest, the most sorely-afflicted among us.

Mr. Carnegie has taught the undiscriminating to value a college by the amount of its endowment. The rule is fast being carried over into the field of social service. "We have abundance of experience to show," writes Mr. E. T. Hartman in the *Survey* for February 20, "that the small salary attracts the small man." Charitable work, recognized as a means of livelihood, necessarily involves the idea of financial remuneration. That, at least, we know from "abundant experience." Charity means working for God. Sociology means that a salary, if not the motive, is the *sine qua non* of service. The distinction is admittedly tenuous.

CHRISTIAN VERSUS COMMERCIAL CHARITY

Mr. Hartman's complaint stresses strongly the difference between commercial and Christian charity, and the distinction is further emphasized by the Report of the City Trustees of St. Mary's Industrial School of Baltimore, an institution conducted by the Xaverian Brothers. As the School receives city and State aid, these corporations are represented by their Boards of Trustees. Under date of December 29, 1914, the City Trustees report:

The Brothers are men well skilled and well educated, capable and efficient, and would command high salaries in the world in the lines of work in which they are engaged. Yet each of these Brothers, regardless of position and work, from the Superintendent down to the Brother just entering the work, is allowed the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars per year for his labor, a stipend so small as to seem ridiculous. But then these Brothers are laboring not for a pecuniary reward, but for the love of God, and in an effort to better the boy and help him grow into a good, honest, industrious man, a credit to the community and a useful citizen thereof. These Brothers are surely doing God's work.

One hundred and fifty dollars a year for expert professional services, services for twenty-four hours a day, and fifty-two weeks a year; exclusive services, too, regarded as one's highest duty. Let us have a few figures, so loved of the modern sociologist. A mathematical friend informs me (for I lisp in numbers), that this princely stipend means a weekly wage of \$2.88, or a sum considerably less than the remuneration allotted to the lowest kind of unskilled labor.

And the reason? The non-Catholic City Trustees of Baltimore may answer for all our Brothers and Sisters.

"They are doing God's work." PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

"Episcopalian," writing to the *New York Sun*, correctly points out that while the Protestant Episcopal Church permits remarriage, when the divorce has been secured "on the statutory grounds allowed by the State of New York," the Catholic Church forbids the remarriage of divorced persons, no matter what the grounds of separation were. "But," continues the correspondent, "there have been instances in each Church where remarriage has been allowed" and he thinks this an inconsistency. It is indeed, but the *Sun* correspondent could write a new page in history, could he adduce a single instance in which the Catholic Church has allowed remarriage to a validly married man or woman.

"High Church" Anglicans are just now delirious with delight. A wandering "Orthodox" Archbishop, Germanos by name, high priest of a Syrian town, happened into Quebec at the time of the consecration of the Anglican Bishop of that place. And lo! His Grace, though refusing "to take part in the laying on of hands," "communicated with the Consecrators and the new made bishop, thus testifying to his belief in the efficacy of the English rite and the validity of English orders." This is a little confusing. In view of the Archbishop's status, the refusal to lay on hands may be quite as significant as "communicating." Indeed the former may be more significant than the latter. And one action contradicts the other: conclusions therefore are hazardous. But then uneasy people clutch at straws in the hope of support: the Anglicans are uneasy about the validity of their Orders: Germanos is a straw set up against his Church which has already officially refused to recognize Anglican Orders.

Not long ago a Chicago reader of *Harper's Weekly* who describes himself as "a poor, sad soul feeling out into the night, longing for light," wrote that he wanted in the time still given him "to become associated with a body of men who are bent on furthering the kingdom of righteousness, here and now, cost what it may." He is seeking a religion free from any special doctrine of "sociology, charitology, lambasting or excoriating," and "Billy Sunday noise." The editor of *Harper's Weekly* seems to think there is no existing Church that will fully meet this inquirer's needs and advises him to "become one of those isolated, believing, sacrificing Christians he talks about." Did that groping correspondent ever hear of the Catholic Church? The ideal he describes can be realized only in her, and in her by no means "isolated" children he will find innumerable "believing, sacrificing Christians" who are "bent on furthering the kingdom of righteousness here and now" and who abominate pagan "sociology" and "Billy Sundayism."

There is a review called the *Atlantic Monthly* published in a quaint old town famous for many reasons. The magazine is considered proper: prim mammas have been known to warn the son and heir never to say anything which he would be ashamed to have appear on its pages. Despite this there is a great deal of the "Round Head" about the review, a self-sufficiency, never so apparent as when its writers treat of Catholicism. "Mon Amie" in the March number is a splendid illustration of the *Atlantic's* spirit. A proud, shallow, emotional, gossipy and apparently hypocritical "slip of a girl" is made the messenger of a hideous accusation against "the priest in charge of one of the largest Parisian churches." No chance of a libel suit there: the writer has his wits about him, even though his style smacks of a youth of four and twenty. He is ecstatic too or nearly so, for he exclaims in a fine frenzy: "The amazing soul of modern France!—which pervades even the walls of convents with its spirit of free criticism and its terrible play of intelligence!"

Why, yes indeed! and when the French measure up to the *Atlantic's* standard of intelligence, convent walls will tumble down and the streets will be piled high with discarded coifs and wimples and veils and habits and birettas and cassocks and missals and breviaries and chasubles and albs and stoles and maniples, and everybody will take the *Atlantic Monthly* for consolation and *uplift*, that is, if it does not become too dull, a danger when intelligence shall have destroyed the object of attack, Catholicism and its ministers.

The delegates elected to meet in convention for the revision of the constitution of the State of New York, will assemble at Albany on April 6 to begin formal proceedings. The leader in the deliberations will be ex-Senator Root who was recently welcomed back to New York at a public banquet, given by former friends and associates. There were many speakers. Among them was Mr. Joseph Choate who, with Mr. Root, shaped the policy of the convention of 1894, which left behind it so many unpleasant memories. According to the report the former gentleman told how "he and Mr. Root lived in Bishop Doane's house at Albany all through the hot summer and worked out the amendments upheld by consciousness of duty and occasional doses of Scotch whiskey." This was a most imprudent remark: there will be a thousand protests against the double stimulant in play at the last convention, the whiskey and the Bishop. This time the Prohibitionists will flood Albany with grape-juice and the secularists will clamor to have the amendments written in the house of a "non-sectarian" bishop. Otherwise "Catholics" as usual, will "dominate" the convention.

During the past week the press, sensational and otherwise, has shocked many good people by proclaiming that French and Belgian priests have told girls in distress from the action of soldiers to "become other Herods." This, of course, makes capital material for a newspaper; it has the one necessary characteristic for catchy "news": It is not true. Under date of March 5 the London *Universe* reports that the Chairman of the Westminster Federation says:

The Executive Committee had communicated on the matter with Bishop De Wachter, Cardinal Mercier's Auxiliary in London, and had been assured that such advice was never given by a Catholic priest. The Bishop thought that a public protest should be made in the Catholic papers, as the story had been circulated all over the world.

Alas, for the public protest! The story will appear and reappear, and the editors of Catholic papers will be deluged with letters of inquiry and expostulations.

The French clergy who are fighting so valiantly in the army of their country, deserve all honor and praise. They are heroes, every one of them. But our enthusiasm for their dauntless courage should not lessen our desire that a priest might never be obliged, under any circumstances, to shed the blood of a fellow man. St. Thomas expresses the mind of the Church by saying:

He who each day participates at the altar in the passion of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, should take no part in the work of death. It is not fitting that he should shed blood. Rather should he be ready to shed his own blood for Christ and in union with Him, thus giving evidence in his life of that which he accomplishes in his ministry.

The law of a contemptible Government ignores all this and the priests, France's best citizens, out of respect for authority, obey the law. "On the chair of Moses have sitten the Scribes and Pharisees. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not."